







# ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY'S PUBLICATIONS

ON SALE AT THE ROOMS OF THE SOCIETY,

22 ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W.

## ORIENTAL TRANSLATION FUND.

### NEW SERIES.

(1-5) REKHAISEK (E.). Mir Khwānd's "Rauzat-us-Safā", or "Garden of Purity". 1891 to 1894. Price 10s. a volume.

(6) TAWNEY (C. H.). The Kathā Koṣa. 1895. Price 10s.

(7) RIDDING (Miss C. M.). Bāṇa's Kūdambari. 1896. Price 10s.

(8) COWELL (E. B.) and THOMAS (F. W.). Bāṇa's Harṣa Carita. 1897. Price 10s.

(9) CHENERY (T.). The first twenty-four Muḥāmūts of al Hariri. 1898. Price 15s.

(10) BRIDGESS (F.). The last twenty-four Muḥāmūts of al Hariri. 1898. Price 15s.

(11) GASTER (M.). The Chronicles of Jerahmeel. 1899. Price 10s.

(12) DAVIDS (Mrs. Rhys). The Dhamma Sangani. 1900. Price 10s.

(13) BEVERIDGE (Mrs. H.). Life and Memoirs of Gulbudan Begum. 1902. Price 10s.

(14, 15) WARREN (T.). On Yuan Chwang's Travels. Edited by T. W. Rhys Davids and S. W. Bushell. 1904-5. Price 10s. a volume.

(16) WHINFIELD (E. H.) and MIRZA MUHAMMAD KAZWINI. The Lawā'ih of Jāmi. Facsimile of an old MS., with a translation and a preface on the influence of Greek philosophy upon Sufism. 1906. Price 5s.

(17) BARNES (L. D.). Antagada-daśo and Ayuttarova-vāya-daśo. From the Prakrit. 1907. Price 5s.

(18) KILGH A. Berriedale). The Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka. 1908. Price 5s.

(19) ROGERS (A.). Memoirs of Jahāngir. Edited by H. Beveridge. 1909. Price 10s.

(20) NICHOLSON (R. A.). The Tarjumān al-Ashwaq of Ibn al-'Arabi. Text and Translation. 1911. Price 7s. 6d.

(21) WANDER (Miss M.). The Man in the Panther's Skin. By Shirda Rustaveli. 1912. Price 10s.

MANGOLJOURN (D. S.). The Heshk-e Bihisht. (In preparation.)



## ASIATIC SOCIETY MONOGRAPHS.

- (1) GUNINI (Colonel G. R.). *Researches on Ptolemy's Geography (Further India and the Indo-Malay Peninsula)*. 8vo. 1909. Price 15s.
- (2) WINTENHUTZ (Dr. M.). *Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. in the R.A.S., with an Appendix by F. W. Thomas*. 8vo. 1902. Price 5s.
- (3) HILGENFELD (Dr. H.). *New Researches into the Composition and Exegesis of the Qoran*. 4to. 1902. Price 5s.
- (4) DAMES (M. Longworth). *The Baloch Race*. 8vo. 1904. Price 5s.
- (5) LE STRANGE (Guy). *Description of Persia and Mesopotamia in the year 1340 A.D., from the Nuzhat-al-Kulüb of Hamd-Allah Mustawfi*. 8vo. 1903. Price 5s.
- (6) BROWN (Professor E. G.). *Chahār Maqāla of Nidhāmi-i-'Arūdi-i-Samarqandī*. 8vo. 1899. Price 3s.
- (7) COCHRAN (O.), M.D., F.S.A. *A Manual of Musliman Numismatics*. 8vo. 1904. Price 7s. 6d.
- (8) GRIEKSON (G. A.), C.I.E. *The Pisāca Languages of North-West India*. 8vo. 1906. Price 5s.
- (9, 10) DAMES (M. Longworth). *Popular Poetry of the Baloches. Text and translation. Two vols*. 8vo. 1907. Price 15s.
- (11) SAYCE (Professor A. H.) and PINCHES (T. G.). *The Tablet from Yuzgat in the Liverpool Institute of Archaeology*. 8vo. 1907. Price 5s.
- (12) BAILEY (Rev. T. Grahame). *The Languages of the Northern Himalayas, being studies in the Grammar of Twenty-six Himalayan Dialects*. 8vo. 1908. Price 5s.
- (13) BAILEY (Rev. T. Grahame). *Kanauri Vocabulary*. 8vo. 1911. Price 3s.
- (14) LE STRANGE (Guy). *Description of the Province of Fāre, in Persia, from the MS. of Ibn-al-Bal'ā*. 8vo. 1912.

## PRIZE PUBLICATIONS FUND.

- (1) HULTZSCH (Professor E.). *Prākītarūpāvatāra of Sīṃharāja. The Text in Nāgarī characters, with Notes, Introduction, and Index*. 8vo. 1909. Price 7s. 6d.
- (2) BONE (Mabel Haynes), Ph.D. *The Pali Literature of Burma*. 8vo. 1909. Price 5s.
- (3) HULTZSCH (Professor E.). *The Māghadūta with Vallabha's Commentary*. 8vo. 1911. Price 7s. 6d.

# OTTO HARRASSOWITZ

## LEIPZIG

### ORIENTAL BOOKSELLER

Official Agent to the India Office, Agent for the sale of the Government Publications, the Publications of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, etc.

#### NEW PUBLICATIONS.

**MEMORIAL VOLUME** in honour of Prof. VILHELM THOMSEN on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, written by his friends and pupils. 1912. 8vo. With four plates. In German, French, and English. M. 10.

This international memorial volume comprises thirty-five articles, dedicated to the well-known scholar by a number of his pupils on the occasion of his seventieth birthday on *thar thryr se play se*, as a sign of their high respect and thankfulness. The themes refer to almost all linguistic sciences, and contain material as valuable to European comparative philology as to that of the near Orient and the far East. The results and discoveries of the latest scientific expeditions are taken into consideration.

**JUSUF and AHMED.** An epic poem in Uzbek language in the Khiwa dialect, published with translation and notes by H. VAMBERG. 1911. 8vo. In German and Uzbek. M. 5.

**ALMKVIST.** Nubian Studies in the Sudan. 1877-8, from his posthumous papers. Edited by K. V. ZETTERSTEN. 1911. 4to. In German. M. 30.

The work contains detailed information relating to the knowledge of the Nubian language, gathered by Professor Almkvist during his stay in Africa from 1878 to 1890. It contains also numerous texts and a considerable Nubian German and German Nubian glossary, so that it forms a valuable supplement to the works of Lepsius and Reinisch.

**HOLMA, H.** The names of the parts of the body in the Assyrian-Babylonian language. An etymological study lexicographically arranged. 1911. 8vo. In German. M. 8.

**RUDNEV, A.** New results on the Manchu language as it is spoken, and Shamanism. 1912. 8vo. Extract of thirty five pages with two illustrations. In German. M. 3.

Contents: 1. An abridged glossary of the language of Northern Manchuria, in phonetic transcription and with Russian translation, indicating also the parallel forms of the language as it is written. 2. Texts: 1. Description of twenty-one Shamanic pictures.

This very interesting publication refutes the general opinion that the spoken Manchu is almost extinct.

**LUN-HENG** Part II: Miscellaneous essays of Wang Ch'ung. Translated from the Chinese and annotated by A. Forke. 1912. gr. 8vo. M. 15.

The first part of this important work contains the philosophical essays and appeared in the year 1907 at the price of M. 15.

I have taken the whole remaining stock of the following work, which is of the highest importance to all scholars interested in the study of Indian religion and literature, viz.:

**SCHERMAN, L.** Materials for a history of Indian visionary literature. 1892. Gr. 8vo. In German. (Instead of M. 10) M. 4.

The work is the first history of Buddhistic eschatology in an abridged form based upon the ancient Indian epic poems (*Satapatha-Brahmana*, *Taittiriya-Brahmana*, *Mahabharata*, *Markandeya-Purana*, etc., etc.).

New Oriental Catalogues: No. 332, *Ostauken*; No. 333, *Ural-altaiische Völker und Sprachen*; No. 343, *Sanskrit-, Pali-, und Prakrit-Literatur, Neuindische Dialekte*. Post free on application. In preparation: No. 342, *Perien, das Hochland von Iran und der Kaukasus*. (Containing the valuable library of the late Professor Dr. Paul Horn of Strassburg.)

**LIBRARIES AND BOOKS BOUGHT FOR CASH.**

# LUZAC & CO.

**Oriental and Foreign Booksellers and Publishers,**

**Official Agents to the India Office; the Imperial Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg; Comité de l'Asie française; Siam Society, Bangkok; Vedanta Publication Committee, New York, etc., etc.**

*LUZAC & CO. are able to supply all English, Foreign, and Oriental Books and Periodicals. They have a large Stock of New and Second-hand Oriental Works, of which they issue regularly Lists and Catalogues, which are to be had on application.*

**LUZAC'S ORIENTAL LIST AND BOOK REVIEW. Annual Subscription, 3s. post free.**

**Vol. XXIII. Nos. 7 and 8. Now Ready.**

## **NEW PUBLICATIONS.**

### **THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF ISLAM.**

**A DICTIONARY OF THE GEOGRAPHY, ETHNOLOGY, AND BIOGRAPHY OF THE MUHAMMADAN PEOPLES.**

Edited by M. TH. HOUTSMA & T. W. ARNOLD.

Part XV now ready. Price 3s. 6d. net.

### **INDIAN DRAWINGS.**

By ANANDA K. COOMARASWAMY.

2nd Series, chiefly Rājput.

4to. Half-bound. pp. 34. Plates xxvi. 25s. net.

### **THE MEMOIRS OF BĀBUR.**

A New Translation of the Bahur-nama.

Incorporating Leyden and Eiskine's of 1826 A.D.

By ANNETTE S. BEVERIDGE, M.B.A.S.

8vo. pp. 185, xvi. 10s. 6d. each.

In 4 parts. Part I now ready.

THE LONDON AND WESTMINSTER LIBRARY, 10, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C. 4.

**LONDON: LUZAC & CO., 46 GREAT RUSSELL STREET, W.C.  
(Opposite the British Museum.)**

# PROBSTHAIN & CO.

*Oriental Booksellers and Publishers.*

*Desire to draw the attention of Libraries, Institutions, Scholars, and Collectors to their large stock of Oriental Books in all branches.*

- Latest Catalogues: No. XII. China. 52 pages.  
XIII. Africa. 48 ..  
XIV. Oriental Religions. 40 pages.  
XV. Library Bushell. Chinese Texts and Translations. 38 pages.  
XVI. XVII. India.  
XIX. XX. Muhammedan Orient and Literature.  
XXI. XXII. Japan and its Art.  
XXIII. Malaya and Australia.  
XXIV. XXV. China and Chinese Art.

## LATEST PUBLICATIONS.

**Essays, Indian and Islamic.** By S. KURDA BRKUSH, M.A. Price 7s. 6d. net.

**Chinese Reader's Manual.** By FR. WM. MAYERS. Reprint. Half-calf. 1910. 15s. net.

**The Maṣnavi by Jellālū'd-dīn Rūmī.** Book the Second. Translated for the first time from the Persian into English Prose, with a large Commentary, by C. E. WILSON, B.A., Professor of Persian, University College, London. 2 vols. Vol. I: Translation. Vol. II: Commentary. Cr. 8vo. 1910. Price of the two volumes: 24s. net. Important to all students of Persian, of Comparative Religion, of Theosophy, and especially of Sufism. The two volumes of about 900 pages, will form the *basis of all future Sufi Research*.

**The Indian Craftsman.** By A. K. COOMARISWAMY, D.Sc. 8vo. 150 pages. Price 3s. 6d. net.

Contents: The Village Craftsman—The Craft Guilds of the Great Cities—The Feudal Craftsman in India and Ceylon—Religious Ideas of Craftsmanship, etc.

**Buddhism as a Religion.** By H. HACKMANN, Lic. Theol. 8vo. pp. xiii. 315. Cloth. Price 6s. net. *The only comprehensive work on Buddhism*, dealing with all its phases.

Contents: The Buddha and his Doctrine—Sketch of History of Buddhism—Modern Buddhism (Ceylon, Burma, Siam, Tibet, China, Korea, Japan, in separate chapters)—Conclusion—Bibliography—Index.

**History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature.** By MAX MÜLLER. Roy. 8vo. pp. 336. Reprint, 1912. Cloth. 15s.

**The First Fifty Discourses from the Collection of the Majjhima Nikāya of Gotama the Buddha, translated from the Pali.** By BUDDHĀSILACARA. 2 vols. Cloth. 7s. 6d. net each.

**Bactria: the History of a Forgotten Empire.** By Professor H. G. RAWLINSON. With 5 Plates and a Map. Now ready.

**41 Great Russell Street, London, W.C.**

# Messrs. W. HEFFER & SONS, Ltd.,

**BOOKSELLERS & PUBLISHERS, CAMBRIDGE.**

hold a select stock of Oriental Literature, of which catalogues are issued regularly. Books not in stock are sought for, and procured intelligently and expeditiously. Messrs. Heffer and Sons are always prepared to purchase libraries of any magnitude for full cash value. Experienced valuers sent to any part of the country, and removal is effected without cost or trouble to vendors.

## LATEST CATALOGUES OF SECOND-HAND BOOKS :

No. 94. **INDIA AND THE EAST** (including the library of the late W. IRVINE, Esq., I.C.S.).

No. 103. **INDIA, PERSIA, AND ARABIA** (including the library of GUY LE STRANGE, Esq.).

*In the press.* **CHINA, JAPAN, AND THE FAR EAST.**

## NEW PUBLICATIONS.

*In the press.*

### Munshi Zaka Ullah.

A Reminiscence of Old Delhi.

by C. F. ANDREWS, M.A.

Demy 8vo. Illustrated.

A biography of one of the most distinguished literary men of Old Delhi. The book promises to be an exceedingly important contribution to the history of the Mutiny.

*Just published*

### Naladamayantivayam-varakhyana.

Edited, with critical notes and introduction, by LEONARD J SEDGWICK, B.A., I.C.S. Demy 8vo. Boards. 2s. 6d. net. Rs. 2.

This book is important in that it is the first attempt to edit a Marathi poem according to Western scholarship.

# Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland.

22 ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W.

## PATRON.

HIS MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY THE KING.

## VICE-PATRON.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA.

## HONORARY VICE-PRESIDENTS.

1910 T. H. THORNTON, Esq., C.S.I., D.C.L.

1911 Sir ROBERT K. DOUGLAS.

## COUNCIL OF MANAGEMENT FOR 1912-13.

### PRESIDENT.

1911 THE RIGHT HON. THE LORD REAY, K.T., G.C.S.I., I.L.D.

### DIRECTOR.

1911 THE RIGHT HON. Sir H. MORTIMER DURAND, G.C.M.G., K.C.S.I., K.C.I.E.

### VICE-PRESIDENTS.

1911 THE RIGHT HON. SYED AMEER ALI, C.I.E., I.L.D.

1912 M. GASTER, Ph.D.

1912 A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE, Esq., C.I.E., Ph.D.

1911 Sir CHARLES J. LYALL, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., I.L.D.

### HONORARY OFFICERS.

1912 O. CODRINGTON, M.D., F.S.A. (*Librarian*).

1912 J. F. FLEET, Esq., C.I.E., Ph.D., I.C.S. ret. (*Secretary*).

1912 J. KENNEDY, Esq., I.C.S. ret. (*Treasurer*).

### ORDINARY MEMBERS OF COUNCIL.

1912 H. F. AMEDROZ, Esq.

1910 PROFESSOR L. D. BARNETT, Litt.D.

1910 C. OTTO BLADGEN, Esq.

1910 A. G. ELLIS, Esq.

1912 Sir G. A. GRIERSON, K.C.I.E., Ph.D., I.C.S. ret.

1909 A. RHUVON GUEST, Esq.

1912 LIONEL C. HOPKINS, Esq., I.S.O.

1912 A. BERRIEDALE KEITH, Esq., M.A., D.C.L.

1912 F. LEGGE, Esq., F.S.A.

1909 PROFESSOR A. A. MACDONELL, M.A., Ph.D.

1910 PROFESSOR D. S. MARGOLIOU, M.A., D.Litt.

1912 F. E. PAROITER, Esq., I.C.S. ret.

1912 LIEUT. COLONEL G. T. PLUNKETT, C.B., R.E. ret.

1911 THE RIGHT HON. Sir ERNEST M. SATOW, G.C.M.G.

1911 Sir J. GEORGE SCOTT, K.C.I.E.

1909 R. SEWELL, Esq., I.C.S. ret.

*Secretary and Librarian, Miss HUGHES.*

*Assistant Secretary and Librarian, H. A. GOOD.*

*Hon. Solicitor, A. HAYMAN WILSON, Esq., Westminster Chambers,  
Aldersgate Street, E.C.4.*



# ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY'S JOURNAL

JANUARY, 1918

## CONTENTS

### ARTICLES

	PAGE
I. The Mahābhārata in Mediaeval Javanese. By D. VAN HINLOOPEN LABBERTON . . . . .	1
II. The Significance of Cairo. By ERNEST RICHMOND . . . . .	23
III. Further Notes on "Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves". By DUNCAN B. MACDONALD . . . . .	41
IV. The Goal of Muhammadan Mysticism. By REYNOLD A. NICHOLSON . . . . .	55
V. Western Manichæism and the Turfan Discoveries. By F. LEGGE . . . . .	69
VI. The Question of Kanishka. By J. F. FLEET, I.C.S. (Retd.), Ph.D., C.I.E. . . . .	95
VII. Tokharian Prātimokṣa Fragment. By Professor SYLVAIN LÉVI . . . . .	109

### MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

Kanishka's Greek. By J. KENNEDY . . . . .	121
Heraus ó túpavros. By J. KENNEDY . . . . .	124
A Passage in the <i>Periplus</i> . By J. KENNEDY . . . . .	127
Proposed Identification of two South-Indian Place-names in the <i>Periplus</i> . By WILFRED H. SCHOFF . . . . .	180
Is the <i>Rāmāyaṇa</i> of Tulasī Dāsa a Translation? By G. A. G. . . . .	188
On the Phonetics of the Wardak Vase. By G. A. G. . . . .	141
Alopen and Śilāditya. By GEORGE A. GRIERSON . . . . .	144
Kaṇamōkya : A Query. By G. A. GRIERSON . . . . .	144
The Origin of the Kṛṣṇa Cult. By N. MACNICOL . . . . .	145
A Copperplate discovered at Kasā, and Buddha's Death-place. By F. E. PARGITER . . . . .	151
The Angula of Six Yavas. By R. BHARASASTRY . . . . .	158



# CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Vrātyas. By A. BERRIEDALE KEITH . . . . .	155
Some Bengali Verbs. By J. D. A. . . . .	160
The Bengali Passive. By J. D. A. . . . .	163
Some Remarks on Chan Ju-kua's Chu Fan Chi. By C. O. BLADEN . . . . .	165
Some Śūfi Lives. By D. S. MARGOLIOUTH . . . . .	169
A supposed Missing MS. of the Arabian Nights. By H. BEVERIDGE . . . . .	170
La Fondation de Goeje . . . . .	171

## NOTICES OF BOOKS

R. W. FRAZER. <i>The Southern Dravidians (Encyclopædia of Religion)</i> . Reviewed by GEORGE A. GRIERSON .	173
E. HULTZSCH. <i>Kalidāsa's Meghadūta</i> . By A. A. MACDONELL	176
Three Plays of Bhāsa in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series. By A. A. MACDONELL . . . . .	186
GEORGE C. O. HAAS. <i>The Dāśarūpa, a Treatise on Hindu Dramaturgy</i> by Dhananjaya. By L. D. BARNETT .	190
HENRICH LÜDER. <i>Bruchstücke Buddhistischer Dramen</i> . By L. D. BARNETT . . . . .	192
OTTO STRAUSS. <i>Ethische Probleme aus dem "Mahā- bhārata"</i> . By A. BERRIEDALE KEITH . . . . .	194
HERMANN OLDENBERG. <i>Ugveda. VII-X. Textkritische und exegetische Noten</i> . By A. BERRIEDALE KEITH	197
Mrs. RHYS DAVIDS, M.A. <i>Buddhism: a Study of the Buddhist Norm</i> . By M. H. BODE . . . . .	201
The Journal of the Burma Research Society. By C. O. BLADEN . . . . .	209
Renward Brandstetter's Monographien zur Indonesischen Sprachforschung. IX. Das Verbum dargestellt auf Grund einer Analyse der besten Texte in Vierund- zwanzig Indonesischen Sprachen. By C. O. BLADEN	211
H. H. JUTNBOLL. <i>Supplement op den Catalogus van de Javaansche en Madoereesche Handschriften der Leidsche Universiteits-Bibliotheek. Deel II.— Supplement op den Catalogus van de Sundaneesche Handschriften en Catalogus van de Balineesche en Sasaksche Handschriften der Leidsche Universiteits- Bibliotheek</i> . By C. O. BLADEN . . . . .	213

# CONTENTS

xi

	PAGE
SOME RECENT ARABIC LITERATURE. By D. S. M. . . .	214
BERTHOLD LAUFER. Jade. By L. C. HOPKINS . . .	220
I. G. GENÄHR. A Chinese English Dictionary in the Cantonese Dialect (by Dr. E. J. Eitel). Reviewed by J. DYER BALL . . . . .	223
BERTHOLD LAUFER. Confucius and his Portraits. By J. DYER BALL . . . . .	224
CHARLES BUDD. Chinese Poems. By J. DYER BALL . .	225
W. A. P. MARTIN, D.D., LL.D. Chinese Legends and Lyrics. By J. DYER BALL . . . . .	226
ELIZABETH LEE. A History of Japan (by Hisao Ludo). Reviewed by J. DYER BALL . . . . .	227
W. N. PORTER. The Tosa Diary. By J. DYER BALL . .	228
DAVID W. MAHRMAN. University of Pennsylvania: The Museum: Publications of the Babylonian Section, Vol. I, No. 1: Babylonian Hymns and Prayers. By T. G. PINCHES . . . . .	228
ALBERT T. CLAY. Business Documents of Murashu Sons of Nippur. By T. G. PINCHES . . . . .	230
ALBERT T. CLAY. Documents from the Temple Archives of Nippur dated in the Reigns of the Kassite Rulers. By T. G. PINCHES . . . . .	233

## NOTES OF THE QUARTER

GENERAL MEETINGS OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY . .	235
PRINCIPAL CONTENTS OF ORIENTAL JOURNALS . . .	236

## OBITUARY NOTICE

SIR RAYMOND WEST, K.C.I.E., LL.D. By WILLIAM LEE WARNER . . . . .	245
--	-----

ADDITIONS TO THE LIBRARY . . . . .	251
------------------------------------	-----



# JOURNAL

OF THE

## ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

### 1913

#### I

#### THE MAHABHARATA IN MEDIAEVAL JAVANESE

By D. VAN HINLOOPEN LABBERTON,

LECTURER ON JAVANESE AT THE GOVERNMENT COLLEGE, BATAVIA,  
LATE MEMBER OF THE DIRECTORIUM OF THE BATAVIAN SOCIETY FOR  
ARTS AND SCIENCES, ETC.

**A**MONG the languages of the Austronesian stock, formerly called the Malayo-Polynesian family, several are entitled to the name of literary languages, languages with a literature of their own in refined prose and poetry.

In only one of them, however—the Old Javanese<sup>1</sup>—has a mediaeval literature been preserved, a fact of great importance from a philological standpoint, because it furnishes us with philological data of no mean value as regards the development of the Austronesian languages in general.

This literature has been guarded—and so preserved to the world—by the piety of the Śaivas and Saugatas, or Śivaïtes and Buddhists, who came as refugees from Java after the Mohammedan conquest and settled in the smaller island of Bali. Generation after generation kept up there the old traditions, recopying the old palm-leaf manuscripts, right down to the present day. In Java

<sup>1</sup> The Old Javanese language is often denoted by the Sanskrit term *Kawi*, though the literary output by no means consists exclusively of poetry.

itself the tradition nearly died out; only fragments of the old tongue survived the rise of a new literature in a language differing as much from the Old Javanese, or Kavi, as the English of to-day does from the older Saxon. So much was this the case that Sir T. S. Raffles, in his well-known *History of Java*, written under the guidance of the most learned Javanese and Madurese of the beginning of the nineteenth century, could only venture on some quite unsatisfactory renderings of inscriptions, etc., preserved in the Old Javanese. Since then much work has been done, for the greater part by Dutch scholars, who published in their own tongue the results of their studies. This was quite natural; but it meant that most of their work remains for the time being a closed book to the general European philological world. Amongst those few but untiring Dutch workers we may name the late Dr. H. N. van der Tuuk, who, during a long stay in the island of Bali, living as a Balinese amongst the Balinese, made a most valuable collection of the sacred and partly secret old manuscripts. Two elaborate catalogues of these collections are appearing, founded on different principles, one prepared by the late Dr. J. Brandes,<sup>1</sup> the other by Dr. H. H. Juyntboll, who is editing a descriptive catalogue of the Manuscripts of the Leyden University Library, to which institution van der Tuuk's collections were bequeathed. During his stay in Bali Dr. van der Tuuk prepared a voluminous *Kort Balinesch-Nederlandsch Woordenboek*, which has appeared at the Government Press (Landsdrukkerij) Batavia under the superintendence of Drs. Brandes and G. A. J. Hazen with the collaboration of Dr. A. Rinkes and the present writer, in four volumes, each containing some 800 (900) big quarto folios.

<sup>1</sup> The premature death of this keen and assiduous scholar was the reason why only two (out of three) parts have as yet appeared. The work bears the title: *Beeskrijving der Javanische, Balinesische, en Soembasche Handschriften*, etc. Batavia, Landsdrukkerij, 1903.

A grammar of the Old Javanese language has not yet been written ; but interesting contributions to it appeared <sup>1</sup> from the pen of the late Leyden Professor, Dr. H. Kern, who has rightly been called *facile princeps* as regards these matters. Among the larger publications we may mention a metrical *Rāmāyaṇam* edited (in modern Javanese characters) by the same, and a glossary (in Roman characters) to this work by Dr. Juynboll. A metrical *Bharatayuddha*, containing the war episode of the *Mahābhārata*, was published (in modern Javanese characters) by Dr. J. G. H. Gunning. Dr. E. C. (I. Jonker edited a *Manuradharmaśāstra* (in Roman characters, with translation), a work based on the *Manusmṛiti* and still used in Bali as a law-book.

Buddhistic writings are fewer in number. They offer, however, remarkable contributions to the study of the Mahayāna form of Buddhism, the essential unity of which with Śaiva teachings is nowhere so unmistakably proclaimed as in Java. There both these forms of Āryan thought must have existed side by side on friendly terms, as they still continue to do in Bali, where however, the Buddhists form a small minority. Of the edited Buddhist works we may here mention the *Kuṅṭarakarma* (in modern Javanese characters and with translation) by Professor Kern and the *Sang Hyang Kamahayanikan* (with translation) by J. Kats.

The influence of the Āryan civilization has been so deep and lasting in Java that even now, though Islām has held undisputed sway during four centuries, yet the old Āryan teachings, though clad in Mohammedan garb, are as vivid as ever, and the heroes of the *Mahābhārata-khyāna* and the *Rāmāyaṇa*, upheld by the fathers as examples of social and religious virtue, are quite familiar to, and revered and beloved by, the village children. In the remnants of the older literature this Āryan influence

<sup>1</sup> In the *Bijdragen*, published by the Royal Institute, The Hague.

plays, indeed, a large part, but the literary activity of the Javanese was by no means restricted to it. Side by side with it grew a national literature of legends and chronicles loosely connected with the former by localizing the events of Bhāratavarṣa in their own homes and by tracing the ancestors of the Javanese dynasties to the heroes of yore.

Old accounts of Java's history in the famous days of Daha, Singhasari and the Majapahit Empire were edited by Dr. Brandes: a prose work called the *Pararaton* (in Roman characters, with translation and most valuable notes) and a poem styled the *Nāgarakṛtāgama* (in Balinese characters). A translation of the last by Professor Kern has since appeared in the *Bijdragen*.

Returning to the *Mahābharatākhyāna*, as preserved in the Old Javanese language, we can state that only eight out of the eighteen parvas were found in Bali, to wit: the *Ādi*, *Udyoga*, *Bhīṣma*, *Virata*, *Aśramavāsa*, *Mausala*, *Prasthanika*, and *Svargarohana* parvas. The four concluding parvas, with the exception of the *Svargarohana*,<sup>1</sup> were the subject of a dissertation by Dr. Juynboll (Leyden, 1893). The texts were edited in Roman characters and translated into Dutch. In 1906 the same scholar published the complete *Adiparva* text with the different readings in Roman characters in order as his preface runs, to make the work more easily accessible for general study. With a view to promoting this aim I propose to give here some extracts from it in English in order to show how the *Mahābhārata* appeared to Java in the eleventh century A.D.

As yet, of the Old Javanese *Adiparva*, only a few episodes have been translated, namely the *Parivandana* (enumeration of contents with number of *ślokas*, etc.) and

<sup>1</sup> Only lately, after the recent subjection of Bali by the Dutch forces, another copy of this was obtained, which is now in the collections of the Batavian Society for Arts and Sciences.

the *Pañcagata ita* by Professor Kern,<sup>1</sup> the *Amṛtamantana* (churning of the ocean) by Dr. Juynboll,<sup>2</sup> Pariksit's death by Dr. Hazen,<sup>3</sup> and the *Garuda-samudbhava* by the present writer.<sup>4</sup> For the text we may rely upon Dr. Juynboll's very accurate edition, based upon eight MSS., most of which belong to the v. d. Tuuk collections. I have occasionally compared the text with the MSS. in possession of the Batavian Society, which showed but slight differences. Throughout the text are spread Sanskrit quotations, which only served as landmarks for writer and hearers or readers, and will be retained in the original in the translation wherever they occur, as they may throw some light on the actual wording of the *Mahābhārata* of the eleventh century in India. Some of these are preserved literally in the published Calcutta, Bombay, and Kumbhakonam Sanskrit texts, but some are now missing.

The character used in the Old Javanese original, styled the Balinese character, is one of more than a dozen varieties (and all varying very much indeed) of the Āryan script adopted in the Archipelago. The alphabet must have contained originally all the fifty-one *akṣaras* required for the transcription of Sanskrit. The sound-system of the Old Javanese being much simpler than that of Sanskrit, there must soon have been a tendency to drop the *akṣaras* not distinguished in pronunciation.

Apart from these orthographic peculiarities our text shows some differences in the proper names, which prove that the tradition preserved in the published Sanskrit

<sup>1</sup> The first in *Bijdragen*, ser. III, vol. vi, pp. 92-3, the last in the *Verhandelingen* of the Royal Academy, 1877.

<sup>2</sup> In *Bijdragen*, ser. vi, vol. i, p. 79 seq.

<sup>3</sup> In *Bijdragen*, ser. vi, vol. v, p. 187 seq. From the same hand appeared a scholarly paper in *Tijdschrift* of the Batavian Society, vol. LXIV, which goes far to prove a great similarity between the Old Javanese *Adiparwa* and Kṣemendra's *Bhāratamāṭjari*.

<sup>4</sup> In *Tijdschrift* of the Batavian Society for Arts and Sciences, 1908.



text does not wholly coincide with the eleventh century text which came to Java.

The frequency of the differences may be seen at a glance by comparing, e.g., the genealogy of the Pūru dynasty given on pp. 89-91 with that in the extant Sanskrit versions.

(In the list marriage will be denoted by  $\times$  ; offspring by  $+$  ; d. means "daughter of" or "princess from". The names peculiar to the Javanese text are printed in italics.)

1. Pūru  $\times$  *Kaśilya*.
2.  $+$  Janamejaya  $\times$  Anantā (*Mogudha's d.*)
3.  $+$  *Pracinvan*  $\times$  *Aśvati*
4.  $+$  *Sampayanī*  $\times$  *Parudhranī* (*Varāngi*)
5.  $+$  *Garhaspatī*  $\times$  Bhānumatī (*Kārtavīrya's d.*)
6.  $+$  *Sarabhauma*  $\times$  *Sarvajñanī* (*Prasenajit's d.*)
7.  $+$  *Ayutanāyī*  $\times$  *Campa*
8.  $+$  *Hydhra*  $\times$  *Dhrama* (*Anga's d.*)
9.  $+$  *Rksa*  $\times$  *Jvālā* (*Taksaka's d.*)
10.  $+$  *Matimara*  $\times$  *Sarasvatī-nadī*
11.  $+$  *Traena*  $\times$  *Kalingī*
12.  $+$  *Ilina*  $\times$  *Upadanarī*.
13.  $+$  *Duśśanta*  $\times$  *Śakuntala*
14.  $+$  *Bharata*  $\times$  *Vatsa*
15.  $+$  *Suhotra*  $\times$  *Saurma* (*Iksvakukula's d.*)
16.  $+$  *Hasti*  $\times$  *Yacodhari* (*Trigarta's d.*)
17.  $+$  *Vikunthana*  $\times$  *Sudevi* (*Draśtva's d.*)
18.  $+$  *Ajamidha*  $\times$  (a) *Adā*  
 $\times$  (b) *Dharmma*  
 $\times$  (c) *Kṛānī*
19.  $+$  (b) *Dhūmrakṣa*  $\times$  *Vimala*
20.  $+$  *Sampvarana*  $\times$  *Tapatī* (*Āditya's d.*)
21.  $+$  *Kuru*  $\times$  *Yamudhā*.
22.  $+$  *Parikṣit*  $\times$  *Idayinī*
23.  $+$  *Sugahī*  $\times$  *Sugāṇī*
24.  $+$  *Bhīmasena*  $\times$  *Kumārī*

25. + Pratiṣṭha × Samantā.  
 26. + Śantanu × (a) Gaṅgā.  
                 × (b) Sayojanagandhā.  
 27. + (b) 1. Citrāngada × Ambikā.  
                2 Citravīrya × Ambalīkā.  
 (27x) By command. Vyāsa × (a) Ambikā.  
   (b) Ambalīkā  
 28. + (a) Dhitarāstra and Kārava-kula  
      + (b) Pandu and Pāndava-kula  
      (c) Vidura (son of Mantri's daughter)

Now there are it is well known in the extant Sanskrit editions of the *Mahabharata* two sets of genealogies for the Puru dynasty one running through Puru x Pausti + Prayna + Manisnu + Randrasya etc and the other through Puru x Kausalya + Janamejaya + Prachinva etc

In the Bombay edition we find the first set in the 94th chapter and the second in the 95th in the Kumbhakonam or South Indian edition the first set is found in the 88th and the second in the 63rd chapter.

The knotty point is to the more reliable of the two sets is decided by our Old Javanese text in favour of the second this being the only one it knows. We may, indeed take this as a valuable hint since the Old Javanese text dates back unaltered save for the introduction of some clerical errors to the eleventh century, whereas the MSS on which the edited Sanskrit texts are based are far more recent.

The recent South Indian edition which may be quoted here as K or Kumbhakonam edition,<sup>1</sup> boasts of having used a manuscript from Ramanad which is styled

Edited at Kumbhakonam by T R Krishnacharya and T R  
Vachaspathy (Printed at Bombay, 1906)

The name B or Bombay edition we would apply to the earlier edition with Nīlakantha's commentary. The C or Calcutta edition shows but slight differences from B. K. has added much matter which is also to be found in the Grantha edition, published at Nārāyaṇīrājapuram, Tanjore district.

by the editor "very, very old", its age being nearly 194 years.<sup>1</sup>

If we now compare the Old Javanese list with the account in the Bombay edition, 95th adhyāya, we find these differences:—

1. × Kausalyā; 2. (Mādhava's d., but K. has Magadha's d.); 3. Pracinvat<sup>2</sup> × Aśmaki (Yādava d.); 4. Samyāti × Dṛpadvata; 5. Ahamyāti; 6. Our Sarvabhauma × Sarvajñāni (Prasenajit's d.) is extended in the Sanskrit editions to five successive rulers, to wit: *Sarvabhauma* × Sunandā (Kakeya's d.) + Jayatsena × Snāravā (Vidarbha's d.) + Avacina × Maryādā (Vidarbha d.) + Ariha × Āngi + *Mahābhauma* × Suyajñā (Prasenajit's d.); 7. × Kāma (Prthuśravaś's d.); 8. Instead of Hṛdhva × Dhvānā (Āṅga's d.) the S. ed. have three rulers, to wit: Akrodhana × Karambhā (Kalinga's d.), Devātithi × Maryādā (Vidha's d.), Ariha [K. has Rea] × Sudevā (Āṅga's d.). 10. The Mātinaṛa of our edition corresponds closely to the Bombay text Matināra, cf. the different readings of this name given in the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*<sup>3</sup>. 11. Bombay text and *Viṣṇupurāṇa* have Tapsu instead of our 'Trasnu': still, that this is no clerical error of the Javanese MSS., but the (or a) genuine name, is proved by the South Indian *Mahabharata* editions both in Nāgarī and Grantha characters, which also read Trasnu.<sup>4</sup> At least one of the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* MSS. compared by Fitzedward Hall has Tramu<sup>5</sup>; 12. Rathantari is given as Īlina's wife (K. reads Hila) instead of Upadānavi, which name we meet with in the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*, iv, p. 132, note 1. 13. The name Duśvanta is written in different ways the Bombay

<sup>1</sup> See the list of manuscripts in the prospectus of the work.

<sup>2</sup> The correction of "Pracinvat" to "Pracinvat" by the editor of Wilson's *Viṣṇupurāṇa* (iv, p. 127, note) is corroborated by the Old Javanese MSS.

<sup>3</sup> Loc. cit., iv, ch. xix.

<sup>4</sup> K. 63, 27; (Gr. 73, 13; K. has in 86, 14, again Tapsu).

<sup>5</sup> *Viṣṇupurāṇa*, loc. cit., jy, p. 129, n. 2; this is the Arrah MS.; see p. 130, n. 2.

edition has Dusyanta, besides which Duṣmanta and Duṣvanta are met elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> All these seem to be variations of an original Duḥ-ṣanta. 14. As Bharata's wife, whose child continues the dynasty, the B. and K. texts give Suandā (Sarvasena's d. from Kāṣṭi). They add as Bharata's son Bhūmanyu × Vijayā (Daśārha's d.<sup>2</sup>) and give 15. Suhotra as Bharata's grandson. 18. To Ajamidha are given four wives named (a) Kāṁkeyi, (b) Gāndhārī, (c) Viśālā, (d) Rikṣā, and, omitting our No. 19, we proceed with 20. Samvarapa as Ajamidha's son. 21. Kuru's wife is named Subhāṅgi (Daśārha's d.) and between Kuru and 22. Parikṣit are added two generations, to wit, Vidūra (K. Vidūratha) × Sampriyā (Mādhava's d.) and Anaśva × Amṛtā (Magadha's d.). As Parikṣit's wife the Bombay edition gives Suyāśā (Bahuda's d.),<sup>3</sup> who is Parikṣit's son in the Old Javanese text, making Bṛhmasena Parikṣit's grandson. Between him and 25. Pratipa the Bombay edition puts Pratiśravas<sup>4</sup> × ?, and so both texts agree in making 26. Śantanu Parikṣit's descendant in the fourth degree.

Śantanu's wife (b) is called in the Bombay edition Satyavati or Gandhakālī, which denote the same person as our descriptive "Sayojanagandhā", but though the birth of Dhṛtarāṣṭra and Pāṇḍu is stated in both texts in a similar fashion, there is some difference as regards No. 27, both Ambikā and Ambālikā being given as Vicitravīrya's wives.

For the sake of completeness I add here the genealogy of the Pūru descendants as given in *Viṣṇupurāṇa*, iv, ch. xix, which runs: Pūru—Janamejaya—Pracinvan—Pravira—Manasyu—Abhayada—Sudyumna—Bahugava—Samyāti—Ahamyāti—Raudrāsya—Rṭeyu—Rantināra—Tapsu

<sup>1</sup> The uncertainty between *y* and *w* is well known; see for the derivation Colebrooke, *Misc. Essays*, vol. 1, p. 42.

<sup>2</sup> K. has Parīśravas, but identifies him with Pratipa.

<sup>3</sup> K. has Suyāśā (Magadha's d.).

<sup>4</sup> K. has Parīśravas, but identifies him with Pratipa.

(Trasnu)—Anila—Dusyanta—Bharata—Bharadvāja—  
 Vitatha—14—Bhavanmanyu—Nara—Bṛhatkṣattrā—  
 Hanti—Ajamidha—Ikṣvā—Samvaraṇa—Kuru—Parikṣit<sup>1</sup>  
 —Janamejaya—?—Pratipa—Śantanu.

Now turning from these genealogies to the text, in order to show the wording of the Old Javanese version, I will choose the Śakuntalā episode (Dr. H. H. Juyāboll, *Ādiparwa*, pp. 65–72), a legend which Kālidāsa has made famous. A comparison of his play with the story as preserved in the *Mahābhārata* shows clearly that this prince of old Indian poets has dealt quite freely with the subject-matter in hand. Though his famous work preceded by centuries<sup>2</sup> the Old Javanese translation as well as the (much younger) Sanskrit *Bharata* MSS. still neither of these seems to be influenced by his way of putting the story, which fact again may prove that it was not permitted to individual genius to alter the ancient lore, faithfully and reverentially handed down from generation to generation.

To sum up the principal differences between Kālidāsa's play and our Old Javanese text, we may mention the introduction of Śakuntalā's handmaids and the king's fool, the story of the wedding-ring as a token of recognition, the transfer of the child's birth and youth to a heavenly hermitage after Śakuntalā's disappearance etc.

Kālidāsa's play may be divided into seven *Ankas* (to pass by the *Viśkumbhaka*) as follows

1. King Dusyanta arrives in the hermitage and meets the girls watering the flowers.

2. Talk with the Vidūṣaka the king's fool.

3. The king and Śakuntalā in the *latamandapa* (bower of creepers).

4. Kaṇva and Śakuntalā.

<sup>1</sup> Vol. iv, p. 148, n. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Kālidāsa's date (fifth century A.D.) is discussed in JEAS. 1909, p. 731 seq. A Dutch translation of his *Abhaya-Śakuntalā*, by Dr. H. Kern, appeared in 1893. Haarlem.

5. Śakuntalā goes to the king's palace, is rejected, and vanishes into the heaven-world.

6. The king painting Śakuntalā's image.

7. King Duśyanta ascends to heaven and finds in the hermitage of Hemakūṭa his wife and child.

In our Old Javanese text we may distinguish these different scenes (*praveśas*)—

1. The king meets Śakuntalā inside the hermit's house.

2. The king hears the tale from the Brāhmaṇa guest.

3. The Gandharva marriage consummated.

4. Śakuntalā and Kaṇva.

5. Birth and youth of Sarvadamana.

6. Śakuntalā and her son go and meet the king

7. The voice of heaven justifies Śakuntalā.

These events are related in a short and graphic way which I shall try to follow as closely as the English idiom permits

### *Sakuntala or Bharata's History*

At King Janamejaya's request to relate to him Bharata's history the wise Vaiśampāyana spoke as follows:

(Once) there was a king, Maharāja Duśyanta by name **पुष्यन्तः सारवाणायाः । (a)<sup>1</sup>** He ruled over an empire stretching unto the four oceans. Nobody committed evil during his reign everywhere righteousness and duty prevailed because of the example of righteousness given by the king at all times. (Once) he went hunting in a forest at the foot of the Himavān, many beasts he hunted, going ever farther and farther. He discovered a hermitage, most lovely with all its flowers, with fruit of every season, adorned by a holy and stainless stream of limpid water. Here all kinds of animals of the forest had gathered. Even lions and tigers seemed to dwell together in love and sympathy with one another, calmed by the anger-quelling force of the holy hermit's thoughts, which turned all fierceness to friendliness. The birds were singing

<sup>1</sup> These letters refer to the end of this chapter.

पुष्पकायाचवहुता वावरविविधिताः । (b). The mingling cries of monkeys and bears were heard as if they were reciting the Vaidic mantras; so their voices rang. The king's heart was quite astonished when he heard the voices of the birds. He entered the *āśrama*, wishing to see the *tapu*.<sup>1</sup> He ordered all his companions to stay behind, so as not to disturb the *āśrama*. Having entered the house he did not find the *tapu*, the *āśrama* being empty. He seated himself and looked inside the house. There he saw a damsel of perfect beauty, like a nymph (*vidyādhari*) descended on earth, who came to bid him welcome, and who offered the king water to wash his feet and rinse his mouth **यायाय्यायामनीय** । (c), and who performed all the duties of hospitality that hermits, whether man or woman, usually show to a guest. The king said: "May I ask you O recluse whose hermitage is this, and where has the owner gone, that I find it empty?" The hermit-maiden answered: "At your orders, O Prince! I ask Your Highness' pardon,<sup>2</sup> the owner of this *āśrama* is called *bhagavān* Kanva. He went in search of fuel (for the holy fire), but he will be back in a minute **मुमूर्त** । (d). Be so kind as to wait here O Paduka Śrī Mahārāja." As the maiden thus spoke love filled the Mahārāja's heart, as though it was wounded, he felt Kāma's arrow **कामधर** । (e) at the sight of this hermit-maiden's beauty; and again he said "Excuse me my fair mother,<sup>3</sup> I have heard about *bhagavān* Kanva, who is,

<sup>1</sup> *Tapu* (from तपः) is the most common term in Java to denote (1) any kind of mental exercise, *yoga*, etc.; (2) every hermit, *yogi*, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Superfluity of polite expressions is still common among the Javanese, who may indeed be styled one of the most polite and well-mannered peoples in the world.

<sup>3</sup> It is the custom among the Javanese to address one another, even strangers, with an appropriate designation of relationship. "younger brother," "older brother," "father," "uncle," "grandfather," etc. "Mother" (*ibu*) is used here even to a young maiden as a token of respect to her ascetic garb. "Fair one" (*ya* or *ayu*) has become a common word to address any housewife or elderly lady not belonging to the Javanese nobility.

they say, a *brāhmaṇa*, who might not mix with woman-kind. If you stay here with him, in what relation do you stand to him? Be so kind to tell me the truth about this!" Thus spoke the king. The hermit-maiden answered: "At your orders, O Prince! He is my father, and as to the way in which he became so, there is here a *Brāhmaṇa* guest; please ask him about my birth." King Duśvanta went and questioned the *Brāhmaṇa* guest. He answered: "Once there was a king, Mahārāja Viśvāmītra by name. He renounced his kingly state, wishing to obtain the greatness of soul<sup>1</sup> of *bhagavan* Vasiṣṭha. Therefore he went for *tapā* to a place not far east from here. He performed *nirahāra*, neither drinking nor eating anything, until his body became powerful. For a long time he thus continued his *tapā*. Indra himself became afraid that he might wrestle his kingdom from him. Now there was a nymph named Menakā, a jewel among the *Apsarasas*. To her Indra spoke 'O Menakā' my child, I have a request to make of you. There is a holy man<sup>2</sup> doing *tapā*, his name is Viśvāmītra. Go and tempt him, in order that his *tapā* may bear no fruit.' The *vidyadhari* answered 'At your orders my lord! But remember his tremendous power (*kamahatmyam*) क्षोभनम् ॥ (f). How much force क्षोभ ॥ (g) he has developed! Supernatural powers, indeed सिद्धिमम् ॥ (h). He would be able to burn up the three worlds. I am afraid of being touched by his curse. If there should be, however, a device to tempt him tell me in what way to act, my lord! that my undertaking may prove successful!' Bhaṭāra Indra answered: 'Have no fear O Menakā! God Vāyu will be your companion and blow the perfume of your cloth to

<sup>1</sup> With a Javanese prefix and suffix used to form abstract nouns: *kamahatmyam*.

<sup>2</sup> *Vīra*! This word, used indiscriminately with *tapā*, *yogi*, *vīra*, etc., is a Prākṛtic transformation of *bhikṣu*, and may be a Buddhistic reminiscence. The original sense of living on begged food has wholly disappeared, and only the connotation of holiness and freedom is left.



Viśvāmitra's seat. God Kāma will direct his arrow and pierce the *tapa's* heart, and love for you will rise in it. In this way his *tapa* may be broken by you.' Thus spoke Lord Indra, and Menakā went. Arrived at the āśrama she pretended to be sporting there, gathering the young leaves of the *nāgapūṣpa* trees.<sup>1</sup> A soft breeze came नव्वायन (i) and lifted her cloth, which Viśvāmitra happened to see and love rose in his heart, being shot by God Kāma's arrow. His love arrow नव्वायन (j) struck, and Viśvāmitra longed for union with the Apsari, and in the end they were united. There by कामरस (k) Menakā became pregnant. She thought herself to have reached her aim and fulfilled Bhaṭāra Indra's order to break Viśvāmitra's *tapa*. She might now return to heaven, so she thought. Now there was a river called Mālini, sprung from the Himavān foot. She followed it upwards and on its bank she bore a child - a girl - which she left to the care of the river bank. Away went Menaka returning to her heavenly home. Mercilessly the child was left alone in a most pitiful state, attended only by the birds. As regards *bhayaṅga* Viśvāmitra, he had already left the hermitage. Now it happened that *bhayaṅga* Kanva went to gather flowers (for *pūja*) along the Malini's banks. He found there a child attended to by (strong) birds बह्वि (l). The *bhayaṅga* took the child in his arms and performed the necessary sacraments<sup>2</sup> naming it Śakuntalā in remembrance of her being attended upon by *ṣakunin*. And so the *bhayaṅga*, O Prince, obtained this child." Thus spoke the Brāhmana guest to the Prince. "This Śakuntalā is the young hermit maiden who

<sup>1</sup> *Acacia farnesii*. In modern Javanese generally called *wayang*, the young leaves of which resemble locks of hair.

<sup>2</sup> *Bhayaṅga* = serpent, is still in use in Java to denote accomplished doctors.

<sup>3</sup> With Javanese infix *manṣmakara* to denote a passive mood of *asakara*, which may mean here performing the birth-rite (*janma krama*), cleansing the child, etc.

welcomed Your Majesty." Having thus been told the whole story by the Brāhmaṇa guest, love arose in King Duśvanta. "An excellent birth is yours, O hermit-girl," he thought, "being the child of a nymph from heaven and a holy sage with supernatural powers, worthy to be my queen." Thus thinking, he proposed to Śakuntalā to become his bride. But Śakuntalā refused, wishing to wait for her father. On the king's insisting upon his proposal, Śakuntalā spoke to him: "At the orders of Your Majesty, but under the condition—and do not break your promise—that my child will be your successor on the lion-seat *सिंहासन* ॥ (m) and will have your kingdom." The king replied: "Have no fear about the fulfilment of my word: your child will succeed to my kingdom." Thus the king spoke, confirming his words by consummating the marriage according to the Gandharva rite. Then he took leave and returned home. Afterwards he would send for Śakuntalā, said the king. Soon after his departure *bhagavan* Kanva returned home from the forest, carrying fuel and flowers. Śakuntalā, however, did not come to meet him, being ashamed at what she had done. Because of his omniscience *bhagavan* Kanva knew all her doings. He spoke: "Śakuntalā, my child! do not vex thyself, thou wilt bear an emperor *चक्रवर्ती* ॥ (n). I know that you did not forget your filial duty towards me and only gave in to King Duśvanta's insisting on your love, and that this was your object in permitting him to take you as his wife according to the Gandharva rite. You have done well, my child!" Thus spoke *bhagavan* Kanva. Śakuntalā made *namaskāra*, and washed the Rṣi's feet. After a long pregnancy, she bore a child, a boy of perfect beauty. Immediately the holy man performed the sacraments according to the Kṣatriya rites. Afterwards the boy attended the hermit at his meditations (*śamādhi*), and so he became at last very powerful, subduing all the wild animals, to begin with

the lions, the tigers, and the elephants—all these were under his sway **सुसुवाणि वदन्** । (o).<sup>1</sup> All the animals were in his power, and he was given the name of All-subduer (*Sarvadamanu*). Having reached the age of 6 years, the beauty of his form shone forth still more. The palms of his hands were marked by a *cakra*, foretelling his future imperial dignity (*kacakruvuryan*) (p). Meanwhile no summons came from the Mahārāja Duśvanta. Sorrow filled Śakuntalā's heart, bewailing her son's fate. *Bhagvān* Kapva knew the emotions which filled Śakuntalā's heart. He ordered some pupils to accompany Śakuntalā to Mahārāja Duśvanta, in order to take his son to him. They went, and arriving in Hastinapura they came before Mahārāja Duśvanta, who was just giving audience to his people. Śakuntalā spoke: "At your orders, O King! some time ago we agreed that, if I should bear you a child, he should be the successor to your throne. To this Your Majesty consented,<sup>2</sup> pledging yourself to fulfil this condition. Having this in view, I submitted to Your Highness. Here is what was deposited by Your Majesty in my womb. His name is *Sarvadamana* **मीः दीवराज्ये अभिषिञ्चता** । (q). It will be befitting now to anoint him **दीवराज्येन सुपुत्रः** । (r), after having proclaimed him as heir apparent." Thus Śakuntalā spoke. Mahārāja Duśvanta answered **कस्य त्वं बुद्धतापसि** । (s): "Who married thee, O wicked recluse! claiming me as thy husband, me who know not thy form, forsooth. Could an emperor ever have married a low-born hermit-girl? Is this *kraton* (royal town and palace) bereft of choicest damsels? Away, thou *mūṣa*! away from here! Do not hope to be made an emperor's wife!" Thus spoke Mahārāja Duśvanta. Śakuntalā wept with

<sup>1</sup> So I propose to read instead of Dr. Juynboll's **वाङ्मयम्**.

<sup>2</sup> The verb *anum* means "by uttering om" = yes.

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Juynboll has **दीवराज्येन**.

<sup>4</sup> An exclamation to drive away a blackmailer.

shame. Still she spoke: "O Mahārāja! how great your pride! But listen to my words: acting thus is worthy of a man of low birth, but not of one like you, O King. As regards your thought, O King, ह्यहो ह्यनकीति । (t) you think: 'I was alone, nobody saw my actions when I married Śakuntalā. 'Who was there to observe me?' Such was your device, O King. But let not Your Highness persist in this course. Remember the divine *Atman*, who lives in your heart वाचात्यक्तमिदं वीर्यम् । (u). He sees all your actions, good or bad. This God is not to be deceived.

वादिह्यचक्रावनिमानवी च बीर्भुनिरायो हृदयं वमय ।

बहव राषिष उमे च संख्ये धर्मस्य ज्ञानाति नरस्य युतं । (r)

*Aditya* the divine Sun, and *Candra*, the divine Moon, *Anila-Anala*, the divine Wind and Fire, next the divine *Akaśa* (Sky), *Prthivī* (Earth) and *Tōya* (the Waters), besides the divine *Atman* (the Self) and the divine *Yama*, these, indeed, are present everywhere. Besides the Day and the Night and the two Twilights, together with God *Dharma*, numbering thirteen in all. These are the witnesses of human actions all the world over, they cannot be blindfolded, and they know all that goes on in the world. Is it possible to think that indeed you doubt me to be your wife as a consequence of my bad *karma*? हीनयुक्तः । (v). And here is your son, so perfect after his *tapā*: but no father to make him happy!¹

प्रतिपद्य च द्वा सुपुर्णरवीरेषु युक्तितः ।

पितुराक्षिप्यते ऽङ्गानि विनिहास्यधिकं युतं । (x)

As stated in the *Āgama* प्रतिपद्य च द्वा सुपुः ॥ the boy just beginning to walk; ईषु dust; युक्तितः ॥ his body covered with dust, enjoying himself, sporting on the ground, when he sees his father पितुराक्षिप्यते ऽङ्गानि । he rushes to him,

¹ I offer this translation tentatively, some words in the text being not quite certain. The Old Javanese sentence runs: *nāhan (nāhan) fupa pūnāhan nāhan nāhan nāhan nāhan nāhan nāhan nāhan nāhan*.

putting his arms round his legs, and, from love for his child, the father embraces him and carries him round in his arms विमिहास्वयधिकं पुत्रं । There is no joy surpassing this. However great the pleasure<sup>1</sup> of one's embracing a beloved wife, when you are longing for the pleasure of holding a child in your arms, to kiss the child is a still greater enjoyment. Does Your Highness feel no love seeing this Sarvadamana, your own flesh बाबादीस्वपुत्रं ॥ (y). He is not lacking in lucky marks, and takes after Your Majesty in all respects. Ah! Your Majesty's heart (*manah*) is too wicked indeed." "Ah! Śakuntalā, who would not agree with your words, that a son gives joy, and supposing this Sarvadamana really were my son, would not I be glad to embrace him? Could it possibly be otherwise? अतिबाहव पुत्रसौ (z). But see his form; is not he too big indeed (for his years) बाबो इतिवत्बाहव ॥ (aa). He seems gifted with most extraordinary powers. If I had a son, could he be like this? कवचकी न कवचे (bb). In short, are you not ashamed of pretending him to be my son? इवेह संवता सबा (cc). Go wherever you like, and don't pretend that I am your husband." As Śrī Mahārāja Duśvanta thus spoke, a voice came from heaven, audible to the King and all his officers. This voice spoke परिजयस्य पुत्रं दुश्मन ॥ (dd): "Ho! Mahārāja Duśvanta, embrace your child without any doubt; indeed, it is your son सत्यमाह प्रकुलजा ॥ (ee). Śakuntalā has spoken the truth: it is you who begot her child" (ff). As the voice from heaven thus spoke, Mahārāja Duśvanta came down from his lion-seat (throne) and embraced Sarvadamana. Then he said in tears to Śakuntalā: "Mother Śakuntalā! I was indeed glad at your arrival. Still, my kingly state prevented me from acknowledging it, since much gossip would have arisen

<sup>1</sup> Read in the Javanese text *amb. ri* for *amburi*. The following *ay* is probably a clerical error.

by the supposition that, you not being my wife, I was going to foist your son as my heir upon the people. Since the voice from heaven has asserted Sarvadamana to be really my son, and such in the presence of all the world, I feel very happy, and I will have him to sit on my lion-seat, that he may become my successor as protector of the world. Let him no longer be named Sarvadamana, 'Bharata' henceforth will be his name, since the Divine voice spoke **भरतं पुत्रं दुष्यन्त !** (O Duśvanta, rear your child !). Thus spoke King Duśvanta, and he asked Śakuntalā to forgive him for having abused her before all his *mantrins* (ministers).

On a favourable day Bharata was anointed and succeeded as protector of the world. He made war upon the neighbouring kings, who submitted to him from fear of his great power. As an emperor, he tried to promote the welfare of the world. He ordered a sacrifice to be performed at which the holy Kanyā acted as priest **विधिं भारतं कुरु** (47). Bharata's greatness was the reason that there is now a Bharata-kula.

Here our Śakuntalā episode ends. Striking a balance between this version in Old Javanese and the extant Sanskrit editions, we find our present version much shorter, approximately only one-third of the B. and C. editions which in seven chapters number more than 300 ślokas. The K. and Gr. editions are longer still, in twelve chapters numbering more than 600 ślokas. Nevertheless, our tale is complete in itself, and seems decidedly the better for being more concise. The detailed descriptions which make the extant S. versions more bulky are to a large extent quite superfluous to the general trend of the story and partly out of place as well—mere accretions due to the wish of later copyists to work out more completely some of the original scenes, or to add some more "wise sayings" or *logia* in *unusukab* metre for the benefit

of the reader. In this way the one Brāhmaṇa host and the few pupils of Kapva of our narrative have not only increased to a large colony of saints, whose doings fill a whole *adhyāya*, where all kinds of knowledge about the different parts of the holy scriptures is displayed, but, after the king has heard them reciting all the Vedas simultaneously, they are disposed of quite easily and nothing is heard about them. The half-sloka in the Javanese text, *Puṇyasvādhyāyasamghuṣṭam vānarurkū-niṣevitam*, is in this respect significant. The same words occur in the S. editions (B. 70. 25, 26; K. 91. 27): but the *pādas* follow in reversed order and are divided over two slokas. Taking our Javanese version, the holy sounds are produced by monkeys and bears, and we can easily see how an orthodox copyist might take exception to these animals even imitating the recital of the holy Vedas and might go so far as to work out the theme into such a complete teaching-body of holy hermits as might do honour to an indigenous university. We miss, however, in the published S. version the finer feeling which makes the young maiden cause her tale to be told by a Brāhmaṇa guest. In the S. versions she herself bluntly tells the whole intimate story of her mother. Kālidāsa had the good sense to introduce some of Śakuntalā's playmates in order to save her the shame of telling the story herself. The hunt is worked out with much detail in the B. text a whole army taking part in it, which army again is described at length. In the Javanese the whole thing is dealt with in a few words, which are quite sufficient for the purpose and the impression which our narrative leaves is much simpler and much more natural.

Most of the Sanskrit quotations of the Javanese text are found both in the B. and the K. editions, as the following enumeration will show. They go to support the supposition of an older version, represented by the

Javanese text, which served as a common basis for the extant S. editions.

a. C. 2801; B. 68. 8; K. 89. 2 पुषिवाचिपुरजायतः ।

b. C. 2868; B. 70. 25, 26; K. 91. 27, 28 (in reversed order).

c. B. 72. 5; K. 92. 7 चादिवाचिष वैव हि । वमप्रापानच रावम् ।

d. B. 72. 9; K. 92. 13.<sup>1</sup>

e. Wanting.

f. C. 2926; B. 71. 27; K. 92. 39.

g. Wanting.

h. Wanting.

i. Wanting.

j. Wanting.

k. Wanting.

l. B. 72. 12. K. 93. 19 वकुषा.

m. Wanting.

n. B. 73. 30. K. 94. 64

o. Wanting.

p. C. 2991. B. 74. 4; K. 75. 19 वकाहितकरः ।

q. B. 74. 17. K. 97. 28 तकात्युपस्त्वया रावजीवरान्ने ऽभिषिञ्चताम्.

r. B. 74. 126 जीवरान्ने ऽभ्येषयत् ।.

s. C. 3006. B. 74. 19.

t. C. 3015. B. 74. 28. K. 98. 8.

u. C. 3018.

v. C. 3017; B. 74. 30. K. 98. 11 (in K. the first pada : चादित्वपव्वापनिजो ऽवजयः ।).

w. Wanting.

x. C. 3040 (last pada : विमत्सव्यधिषो वुषः ।); B. 74. 53;

<sup>1</sup> The Javanese text says here that Kaṇva has gone out in search for fuel (*smiddharuṇḍya*). Now in the S. Maṭṭh. the *ppi* is said to have gone out in search for "fruits". In Kalidāsa's *Aśvamedha* the expression *Samiddharuṇḍyaprasāhita rapam* = "we went out to fetch fuel", occurs (ed. Böhtlingk, p. 7); but Kaṇva himself is said to have gone to Somatṛṭha to neutralise a bad fate threatening his daughter.



K. 98. 45 (K. reads: चरिपुत्र चवा वृषभैरवीरिपुत्रुक्तिः । विपुत्राविपुत्रे ऽप्यापि विमलमयधिकं ततः ।).

y. Wanting.

s and aa together. B. 74. 79; K. 98. 86.

bb and cc. I. 3064; B. 74. 77; K. 98. 97 (चवेड वव्यतामितः ।).

dd and ee. C. 3102, 3103; B. 74. 111, 112; K. takes them together, 100. 2 भरस पुषं दीपतिं वलमाह वकुतावा ।.

ff. K. 100. 9 तत्तामरस दुष्पल पुषं वाकुतावं वृष.

gg. C. 3112; B. 74. 131; K. 100. 12.

From our few analytical remarks it will be seen that more material must be brought forward before anything can be done towards finding a conclusive answer to the interesting question : From which part of India, the north or the south, was the eleventh century *Bhāratam* brought to Java ?<sup>1</sup> This much, however, seems certain that this Old Javanese text may prove useful in the verification of several details which embarrass the students of the *Bhāratam*.

If their interest in the text published by Dr. H. H. Juynboll is aroused, the chief aim of the present contribution will have been attained

<sup>1</sup> After due consideration of argument I cannot quite agree with my learned friend Dr. Hazen, who tries to prove in his paper on "The Old Javanese *Ādiparwa* and its Sanskrit Original" (*Tydschrift Batav. Soc.* vol. xlv, cited above) that the Old Javanese version must have come from Kashmir, or at least from North West India, because a certain number of similarities are proved to exist between the Old Javanese *Ādiparwa* and the *Bhāratamuṅjari* of the quasi-epical Kashmirian poet Kāmeṇdra, since we have no proof whatever that about the eleventh century in other parts of India the *M B* text differed in these points from the Kashmir traditions.

## THE SIGNIFICANCE OF CAIRO

By ERNEST RICHMOND

**A**MONG the many peculiarities of Egypt, not the least notable is her instinct for rejecting the foreign influences which her position at the gates of three continents renders exceptionally numerous. This power to repudiate what is alien seems to belong to the very genius of the land. It is, perhaps, a sign of the sufficiency and adequacy of Egypt for herself; an indication that within herself she finds what she needs for her existence and for her development, and that the outer world and its gifts are not required. Her ancient history is an eloquent witness of her own peculiar power; a power to achieve, to develop, and to realize the highest that is in her, only under conditions of comparative isolation, or under such conditions of contact as leave her full freedom of choice; and her less ancient, as well as her modern, history no less eloquently testify to the deadening effects of contact with the outer world.

It would be a fascinating, though highly speculative task, to trace the gradual change in the outward and visible manifestation of Egypt's spirit; the change from the days of comparative seclusion, accompanied by slow though positive development towards, and ultimate achievement of, a unique civilization, to those of free and unrestrained contact with the outer world, culminating in a short-lived empire, followed by conquest and apparently permanent collapse and stagnation.

To give, but not to receive, seems to describe the function of Egypt since she became a part of the rest of the world. The foreign element, which must be present in all countries, being unable, in the case of Egypt, to fuse

effectively with what is native, concentrates itself at a point whence it dominates the whole country and takes what Egypt has to give. During the thousand years previous to the Arab invasion, when Egypt was ruled by powers from the northern shores of the Mediterranean, Alexandria, representing ancient Europe, formed this point of foreign concentration. After the Arab invasion, and for another thousand years, Asia took the place of Europe, and the chief result was the city of Cairo. And now that the whirligig of time has once more placed the produce of Egypt in Europe's hands two points of foreign activity exist, the one Cairo and the other Alexandria.

It is the purpose of this paper to emphasize the foreign character of Cairo; to show that between it and the rest of Egypt there not only is to-day, but always has been since its foundation in the seventh century, a marked line of cleavage, and to indicate how, in the buildings of Cairo, we are able to trace, not any part of the story of Egypt, but rather that of a continuous stream of rulers and workers which has flowed from many sources and has given to Cairo architecture a curiously mixed character, a character that reflects change and variety of origin instead of local development, accretion from without rather than growth from within.

Those who have lived in Egypt or have studied the history of its people know how the character of the land where nature is herself unvarying, has moulded a people whom, in essentials, no changes of state have for at least 5,000 years succeeded in altering. However great may be the Egyptian's power of outward adaptation to or imitation of foreign modes of expression, he seems to reject, apparently instinctively, the central idea which gives vitality and meaning to the outward form or custom he assumes, and to give his assent rather to a formula than to a truth. The steadfast and unalterable nature of

the Egyptian should not be lost sight of if we wish to form a clear conception of the results which would probably arise from such an irruption into Egypt as that which took place in the seventh century, when, round the fortress of Babylon, the Arab invaders pitched the camp destined to develop into the city we now call Cairo.

What did the Arabs then find? They found a country overspread by the products of Byzantine civilization, and a people who, having in their long-secluded past evolved a civilization peculiarly their own, had, for more than ten centuries, been dominated by powers which had risen to greatness in an environment as different as it is possible to imagine to that from which the civilization of ancient Egypt had sprung; so different, indeed, that fusion of ideas was difficult; and, when it did take place, was of a one-sided character: the foreigners rather than the natives being the gainers. The Greeks and the Romans may have borrowed, learnt, or absorbed much from Egypt, but Egypt, it would seem, had already fulfilled her task. She took nothing in return, and the Egyptians, as we know from Diodorus, still remained foreign to the new civilization, rigidly themselves, a people apart, with a power perhaps of imitation but not of assimilation. The conditions at the time of the Arab conquest were, in essentials, very much what they are to-day; but it is probable that they presented even greater contrasts than now exist between the appearance of a European civilization on the one hand, and on the other the essentially unchanging character of the Egyptian. How unchanging may partly be appreciated when it is remembered that the language of the country (a characteristic easily lost) still found a speaker in the seventeenth century and to-day, in church services, if not understood it is at least still used. But this idea will best be illustrated by a reference to the buildings of Egypt, which reflect more clearly perhaps than any other medium the genius of the

land, and the deep-seated differences between it and the outer world, whether the latter be represented by ancient Byzantium or by modern Europe.

The original building material of Egypt is mud; and on the lines originally laid down by the limitations of this material did the gigantic Egyptian architecture slowly evolve. But it never lost the character given to it by its origin, and, although the Egyptians employed stone, they did so in a manner that showed how far they were from an appreciation of its structural possibilities, and how deeply ingrained in their nature was the memory of the ages when they had toiled in mud alone. There is little, if any, difference structurally between a stone and a mud brick pyramid. The walls and gateways of many a stone-built temple might have been built in mud brick and palm-trees without altering either their shape or dimensions, and the columns are copies as it were in stone of others of which the original conception in mud reinforced with reeds, seems to have been indelibly stamped in the memory of the Egyptian architect.

To this mud ancestry, as much as to any other cause does Egyptian architecture owe its immense proportions. A mud wall, to be stable, must be massive and of a thickness compared to its height, which would be disproportionate if applied in stone. Egyptian stone masonry, however, follows, in its proportion of voids to solids dimensions which would be suitable in mud and owes its stability, not to method but to mass.

The same absence of method characterizes really Egyptian work of all ages. We trace it through the Coptic period to our own day, and in the more remote parts of the country where Egyptians still work in comparative isolation we find them engaged on buildings the forms of which recall those of ancient Egypt: while, in the less remote places, the Egyptian conception of masonry construction tends to exasperate those foreign

builders to whom experience has not yet taught an appreciation of its strictly local media.

The merits of a really Egyptian building lie in its suitability to the purpose for which it is intended, and in its harmony with the physical conditions of its environment. In the first place it must be remembered that the meaning of a house to an Egyptian is little more than a place in which he may store his possessions and pass the night. The Egyptian's business and life are in his fields by day, and indeed often even by night. The problem before him in his house building is not to produce a place of business or comfort, but a place of comparative privacy, capable of offering what he considers an adequate resistance to the two great forces which tend, in the Nile Valley, to disintegrate structures, the sun and the annual rise and fall in the water levels.

The thick and loosely built walls of an Egyptian house aim at adaptation to the movements brought into play by these forces. The mud of the Nile provides an admirable material for such a purpose. A building of sun-dried bricks laid in mud mortar, and strengthened, as is often the case, with timber laid in the walls, is sufficient for the needs of the Egyptian, as well as fitted to its peculiar environment.

This mud architecture is the architecture natural to Egypt. It is the architecture of the present and of the past, and although in ancient Egypt the great permanent buildings of state were executed in stone, it is clear, as has been said, from their forms and dimensions that they were not only conceived in an ineradicable mud tradition, but also executed on lines which bear a structural affinity rather to mud than to stone.

A marked tendency of modern European building is towards rapidity of construction, rigidity, a high standard of comfort and low maintenance charges. The Egyptian climate, the Egyptian's manner of life, and his conception

of its object are such as to make these aims for the most part either meaningless or undesirable. Hence arises a source of profound misunderstanding between Egyptians and foreigners. When the European begins to feel bound to dispel the ignorance or to contradict the superstitions of natives, he is apparently prompted by the curious assumption that it is the Egyptian's ultimate destiny to resemble the European. When for example he undertakes the enterprise of teaching the Egyptian how to build, he means, of course, though he may not always appreciate it, that it is his intention to teach the Egyptian how to build in a manner capable of fulfilling, not the Egyptian's but the European's needs. The Egyptian already knows how to meet, structurally, the requirements of his own manner of life, and the task of teaching him to build with the object of providing wants, the outcome of a conception of existence and of ambitions to which he is a stranger, results, not unnaturally, in little lasting profit either to the pupil or to his self-constituted teacher. Another and more notable instance of the process referred to is, of course, the evergreen attempt to teach Egyptians— a people hermit-natured, unaggressive, and agricultural in a complete and unique sense—to rule themselves in a manner agreeable to the commercial and trading requirements of modern Europe and the Levant. Time does not allow a reference in greater detail to these differences in aim. It is sufficient for the present purpose to add that as in the field of building, so it is in most other fields in which Europe takes up the position of teacher especially if the subject taught is something not even remotely connected with anything the Egyptians have been in the habit of doing; of something strange to all local association and all hereditary skill; of something therefore which the pupil has neither intelligible reason to learn nor visible object in assimilating.

Though the ideals and needs of the foreigner in Egypt during the Byzantine period may have differed from our own, there is no reason to suppose that they approached more nearly to Egyptian needs and ideals than do those of the modern European. Hence it is probable that this contact of foreigner and native, of Greek and Egyptian, produced when Egypt was a Byzantine Province, results analogous to those with which we are familiar to-day. As to-day we see among a small proportion of Egyptians a process of outward imitation of Europe, in dress, in expression, in political catchwords, and even in architecture unaccompanied by any signs of inward Europeanization, so in the Byzantine period we are able to trace through the architecture an imitation of the foreign features—Basilican or Byzantine—introduced by foreigners from the northern shores of the Mediterranean; features which clothe and are supported by structures undeniably Egyptian in their innocence of outline and external architectural form, negative qualities which are the direct outcome of traditional Egyptian methods and materials of construction. How persistent are these traditions may be gauged by an examination of the fourth century monasteries near Sohag in Upper Egypt, in the structure of which there is much which not only recalls ancient Egypt, but also bears unmistakable affinity to the work of modern Egyptian peasants. The thick walls of these monasteries rise with the batter characteristic of the mud traditions perpetuated in all Egyptian work, and are crowned with the familiar ancient Egyptian cavetto cornice of which we see the embryo to-day in the capping of reeds given by peasants to their mud brick walls. And in the same buildings which possess these typically Egyptian characteristics we find Byzantine frescoes, Byzantine capitals, and a foreign apsidal arrangement of plan. The interest of these buildings cannot be overstated, exemplifying an



they do that though an ancient monumental architecture, born and nurtured in an immemorial tradition of mud, was still of use in the fourth century in respect of those parts of a building where its heavy masses were applicable, yet it was incapable of complete adaptation, within a reasonable compass, to the monumental needs of a Christian ritual which called for a certain complication of plan, a richness of detail, and a comparatively small scale of execution, requirements which, taken in conjunction, were incompatible with an architecture so deeply rooted in its mud ancestry as is that of Egypt. Hence, contact with the outer world, bringing as it did new economic conditions as well as a new religion, caused the gradual abandonment, for monumental purposes, of the local architecture and its relegation to its original purpose, the fulfilment of peasants' needs, and brought into use in its place an imitation of foreign forms which had, and could have, no root in the country. Coptic art being, then, no more inherent in the people or natural to the country than are the forms of modern European art, it is not surprising that it should totally disappear after the Arab invasion had brought about an upheaval of established order. This supposition that it did so disappear, is, as will be seen, borne out by evidence which will be adduced from the Moslem buildings of Cairo. The Arabs, in the first instance brought of course nothing with them except Islam. but subsequently, as a result of the worldwide power of Islam came in course of time a conglomeration of the arts of conquered peoples. Familiar as were the Moslem occupiers of Egypt with the architectural splendours of Mesopotamia, Syria, and other conquered countries, it is not surprising that they should have found little to satisfy their aspirations in the architectural skill of Egypt, represented as it was on the one hand by a local architecture now debased to the fulfilment only of peasants' needs; and, on the

other, by a fashion already moribund, since the power which had maintained its vitality had disappeared.

It is unfortunate that we have no monument remaining to us in Egypt representative of the first two centuries of Moslem rule. The mosque of Amr, the Arab conqueror, has been so altered and added to, as to provide no safe guide to an appreciation of the character of the early Moslem buildings. The earliest authentic Moslem building in Egypt is the famous mosque built in Cairo by Ahmed Ibn Tulun in the last quarter of the ninth century.

This mosque contains no trace of Coptic art. It is hard to imagine more decisive evidence of the superficial character of Byzantine influence in Egypt than the total disappearance of its outward manifestation in architecture, only two centuries after the collapse of Byzantine rule.

If the art which we call Coptic had in any deep sense been Egyptian, the new requirements of Islam would have found in it a powerful means of expression and a vehicle which, being endowed with the vitality of a local growth, would have produced in Egypt a Moslem architecture tinged with an Egyptian character; just as, in other lands conquered by Islam, the architecture which sprang into being not only provided the requirements of the new religion but also reflected something of the technical traditions and of the physical character of its environment. For instance, in the Mohammedan buildings of Asia Minor are continued the splendid stone traditions of that country; and many mosques in the more westerly parts are absolutely Byzantine; while in India the local and traditional skill which had produced the Jaina temples contributed an important element to the Moslem architecture. But the first Moslem building in Egypt is not Egyptian, not even Byzantine: it is Mesopotamian.

The plan of Ibn Tulun is simple. It consists of a large rectangular open court surrounded by arcades. Brick piers carry the arches of the arcades. A plain wall

placed high up at intervals by small arched windows across the whole area. A flat timber roof supported partly by the outer walls and partly by the arcades, gives ample shelter for a very considerable number of worshippers. In the necessity for securing by simple means seclusion and shelter for a large number of people, we find a sufficient reason for the development of this plan. It is the character and the material of the ornament rather than the plan which guides as to ascertaining the ancestry of this mosque. The stucco capitals of the engaged corner columns of the brick piers belong, as Miss Gertrude Bell has shown, to the same Mesopotamian family as the mosques at Samarra and at Rakka. No Egyptian stucco work of this character is known. Another feature which connects this mosque with Mesopotamia is the spiral minaret, the last descendant of the Babylonian Zigurrat. There can be no doubt that this mosque is the work of artists imported from Mesopotamia.

For the next 250 years, that is, until the beginning of the twelfth century, Cairo mosque builders seem to have followed pretty consistently the Mesopotamian tradition of brick ornamented by stucco, or, as it would probably be more correct to say, Mesopotamian workers found Cairo during that period a favourable and profitable field for the exercise of their arts. Both the mosques of Al Azhar and of El Hakim belong to the same school of workers as that of Ibn Tulun.

In the mosque of El Hakim, built 120 years later, we find the same solid brick piers and engaged corner columns, pointed arches of the same shape, and the same method of stucco decoration, and in the mosque of Al Azhar, which is somewhat earlier than El Hakim, is found the flat-haunched and pointed arch, a shape of arch of which the earliest example is, I believe, found in the Bagdad Gate of Rakka.

As Cairo gradually grew, owing to its position, to be

the richest Mohammedan city in the Near-East, it drew to itself, from other Mohammedan lands an ever-increasing stream of workers. Cairo, judged by its architecture, does not seem to have been invaded, to any appreciable extent, by the building traditions of Egypt.

Though Egyptian labour was probably used, as it is now, for carrying out excavation and other earthworks, or in the rougher forms of walling, the evidence afforded by the buildings themselves leads to a belief that the main body of workers were foreign, or of foreign origin. If, as has been shown, the earlier Cairo mosques are far from being Egyptian, the mosque of Al Akmar, built about 150 years after that of Al Hakim, is no less so. The "façade", found for the first time in this mosque, is not a characteristic of Egyptian building of any period. The breaking of external wall surfaces by blind niches, a treatment which is the basis of the architectural theme in the façade of Al Akmar, is, however, immemorial in Oriental Asiatic brickwork, and in Central Asia Minor we find the same idea though here it is almost always in stone.

We see, then in this mosque a repetition of an ancient Asiatic not Egyptian theme. It is unnecessary to speculate on the circumstances which brought it to Cairo, which as a rich and important city of the Moslem world, was able to command architectural skill and knowledge from far beyond the boundaries of Egypt. This is another point of interest in the mosque of Al Akmar. It represents not only the outer world, but a new importation from the outer world, not a development from previous buildings in Cairo, but a product of a new group of workers from abroad. Except in respect of plan, which, as requirements have not changed, remains in its broad principles similar to those of earlier mosques, there is no point of likeness between it and previous buildings.

The mosque of Sultan Kaloun, built a century and

a half later than Al Akmar, presents, in a striking manner the two most salient characteristics of Cairo Moslem architecture, its foreign character on the one hand, and on the other its variety and its deficiency in evidence of any growth, traceable from building to building and progressing steadily towards a definite architectural object.

Between the mosque of Sultan Kalaun, built about 150 years later than Al Akmar, and any earlier building there is little if any, architectural affinity. The motive of the façade has nothing in common with that of Al Akmar or even with that of Nigm ed Din, which is only forty years earlier. The façade of S. Kalaun does not consist of a wall decorated with niches, but rather of a wall fortified by buttresses, the heads of which are connected by arches; or, in other words, of well-defined groups of masonry in the form of piers, the wall spaces between the piers being pierced by windows. As there is nothing in the plan to account for this, one is tempted to explain it as a transcription of Crusaders' work in Syria. The accent, also, given by the vertical lines, and the division of the windows into lights, make this building reminiscent, though feebly so, of a character belonging to Mediaeval European architecture. We know that the Saracens were impressed by the beauty of the architecture they found in Syria during the Crusades. Mohammed en Nasir even took the trouble to transport bodily to Cairo and set up in his mosque a Gothic doorway taken from the Cathedral of Acre.

The mosque of Sultan Hasan is a witness even more eloquent than that of S. Kalaun of the character of Cairo architecture, and indirectly, of the significance of Cairo. Although only seventy years separate these mosques there is little if any architectural resemblance between the two buildings. Apart from its immense size (nothing built since the Arab invasion can compare to it in this respect) it is peculiar in the arrangement of its plan. The tomb

is usually placed at one angle; here it is placed axially with the mosque. The great portal and the four great spaces roofed by barrel vaults and surrounding an open court suggest a conception originating in a mind familiar with Asiatic traditional forms: while, in the naturalistic carvings, the broad bands of ornament, the use of stalactites without structural meaning, we feel the presence of a fresh importation of foreign workmen. Whence did the master builder and the workmen come? Herz Bey, in his monograph on this mosque, has pointed out that in the buildings of Ak Khan, Sirtelli Medressa, and Energhé Djama, of Konia in Asia Minor, we find many features found also in the mosque of Sultan Hassan, such as wide bands of ornament and stalactites used in no structural sense. It is possible that the builders of Sultan Hassan's mosque were sent to Cairo by arrangement with the Seljukian ruler. We have seen similar incidents in more modern days. We know that Sultan Hassan was ambitious that his mosque should excel all other buildings, and he could hardly have done better than import masons from Asia Minor, where their skill was part of a tradition which went back to a period considerably anterior to the beginnings of Islam.

Up to and including the time of Sultan Hassan we see then that Cairo has been continually flooded by foreign workers. A great body of craftsmen of all sorts and from many lands is continually coming to Cairo and carrying with them a wonderful variety of tradition, experience, and knowledge, brought mostly from Asia, but also, possibly directly and certainly indirectly, from Europe. This concourse of workers, always refreshed from abroad, gave expression to its artistic instincts under a variety of forms, such as I have attempted, though summarily, to indicate. It is not until we reach a period subsequent to the middle of the fourteenth century that we find evidence of any process which can

be called development towards a distinct style of architectural expression. The best example of this phase is afforded by the mosque of Kait Bey built rather more than one hundred years after Sultan Hassan's mosque. The seeds sown by previous inroads of foreign workers and ideas seem, in the fifteenth century, to have succeeded in taking some root. But here, again, it is impossible to doubt a continued inflow in this century of considerable numbers of foreign workers, more particularly perhaps from Anatolia or from Armenia, or from some country of established stone-building traditions, to the skill of whose masons Cairo probably owes the unparalleled series of stone domes which form her crowning architectural glory.

This period was not, however, to last long. In the fifteenth century and the beginning of the sixteenth, events occurred which robbed Cairo of her power to attract the skill and intellect of foreign countries. In the first place, when the Cape route was discovered in 1498, Cairo lost a great source of her wealth. Europe's Eastern trade was diverted, and the goods upon which the masters of Syria and Egypt had levied customs dues no longer came from the Red Sea and Persian Gulf for transfer to the harbours of Alexandretta and Alexandria. In the second place, Cairo gave place to Constantinople as the chief Moslem city in the Near East and the Ottoman Turks annexed both Egypt and Syria and just as many centuries earlier the rise of Constantinople had contributed to the decay of Alexandria, Egypt's Greek capital, so now the passing of Constantinople into Asiatic and Moslem hands promoted the decay of Cairo, Egypt's Asiatic capital. For it was natural that the superior prestige of Constantinople as a Moslem centre should attract to that city the best technical and artistic skill of the neighbouring Moslem countries; and indeed, as El Garhagtee tells us, Sultan Selim II took away with him to Constantinople so many masters of crafts

that fifty manual crafts ceased to be practised in Cairo. It must not be supposed that these events, disastrous though they were to the city of Cairo, meant to the rest of Egypt and to the Egyptians anything more than a shuffling and a changing among the foreigners in the alien city which happened to exercise its power over them. Egypt lives its agricultural life apart from vicissitudes in the fortunes of Cairo. Such a change in the central administration as that which took place when the country came under Ottoman rule in the beginning of the sixteenth century was not likely, in comparison with former days, to be either beneficial or the reverse to the inhabitants of Egypt. What has been termed the discovery of economic man had not been made, that is to say, the material blessings which accrue, not only to the ruled, but also to the rulers, as the results of what we call good administration were not, perhaps, at that time appreciated as they are to-day in the Eastern Mediterranean, and subject peoples were, more than is the case now, expected to make bricks without straw, and their countries were strained to produce without the necessary manure, to which efficient machinery of government may be likened. Though there was a great reduction in the wealth and power of Cairo her essentially foreign character, as reflected in her architecture, remained unaltered and has continued unaltered to the present day.

New architectural forms came into use with every change in the source of the representative foreign power. Under the Ottomans we find the Constantinople type of mosque derived from the Byzantine Church: and, under modern Europe, Cairo's hotels, business houses, and barracks reflect a spirit no more and no less removed from all that is Egyptian than does the mosque of Ibn Tulun or any other of the buildings constructed since the foundation of Fustat and of the various foreign towns which, now amalgamated, form the City of Cairo.



It is, then, unprofitable historically to consider Cairo architecture of any period from a point of view similar to that from which we examine the architecture of any town in Europe. Whether its buildings are Gothic or of the Renaissance period, a town in England is, architecturally, primarily of an English character, and one in France of a French character. Cairo, however, is not Egyptian, but represents different parts of the world at different periods: and, although one might expect a town fed from so many sources of architectural splendour to produce a growth not only distinguished in form, but also, elementally, local and indigenous in character, yet this is not the case with Cairo architecture, for the reason that the necessary local vitality to sustain and develop such a growth is absent: and it is not possible to discover in the architecture of Cairo the existence of any native Egyptian stock upon which foreign influences were grafted, nor any Egyptian element supplying vitality and continuity of development. Practically the whole of the architectural energy which has gone to the building of Cairo has come from abroad: but, owing in part to the wide area from which this foreign energy was and is always flowing and passing into Cairo and in part, to the fact that the climate of Egypt is not favourable to a continuance of vigour among foreigners the tree of Cairo architecture is not seen to develop from seed to flower but rather to come fully grown from abroad, to be planted, to decay, and to be replaced by another.

In the minor crafts and smaller details of architecture as for example in joinery plaster-work, mosaic or marble work, something in the nature of a tradition no doubt established itself in the town among those of the poorer imported craftsmen and their descendants who happened to be strong enough to survive for more than a few generations, possibly by mixing to some extent with natives of Egypt, just as happens now among the poorer

foreigners. But such a body of workers would not, in the past, any more than in the present, produce a master capable of any big conception; hence it is that larger architectural themes or forms, all big and new ideas come without exception from the blood of foreigners in Cairo mingled in a tank. It will stagnate, but refreshment comes from without. Happily for the future of Cairo, even, perhaps, of Egypt, it may be hoped that increasing ease of communication with the outer world, may, though at a distant date, by counteracting to some extent adverse climatic conditions, give to this process of refreshment a power to endow the thought and work of this alien city, if not with the sturdy character we associate with local development, at any rate with greater unity, stability, and continuity than has been the case in the past or is the case in the present.

It is not unnatural that the foreign visitor to Egypt should be inclined to regard Cairo as a town bearing the same relation to the rest of the country as that borne by any other important city to the country of which it is the capital, and to assume that in Cairo we see concentrated, to a large extent the tendencies and ambitions of Egypt as a whole, and the developing seeds of its life, moral, intellectual and material. In a word, that Cairo represents the central welter of Egyptian life. Nothing could be further from the truth. The significance of Cairo lies in its being representative, not of Egypt, but of the outer world. It is a point towards which through more than ten centuries the geographical position of Egypt, and the nature of the country and of its inhabitants, have made it possible and indeed inevitable that a continual stream of foreigners should flow, sometimes, as now, abundantly, and at others less so, from north and west and east.

It is here at the point of the Delta, at the end as it were, of a funnel whose mouth is open to the world, that

we see concentrated, not the people of Egypt, but rather the forces which are contending for the spoils of Egypt. In the buildings of Cairo the history of this continual struggle can be traced : in the political propaganda which emanate from Cairo it is further illustrated, and in the people of Cairo we see, for the most part, the deposited residuum of a continual inflow of aliens, Asiatic, European, and African, whose sympathies, occupations, traditions, and aims are as widely different from those of the true Egyptian as are the modern buildings of Europe and the Levant from the buildings of Egypt, whether she be represented by the temples of Karnak and Luxor or by the mud dwellings of the present-day peasant.

In conclusion it may be said then that Cairo is to be identified with the spirit of change ; Egypt with that of stability. Cairo looks always to the outer world for her life and her inspiration, while Egypt looks solely to what her river brings. In Cairo we see, not perhaps always in their most attractive form, something of the eager ambitions and devouring anxieties of the outer world : and it is to these foreign ambitions or to these foreign anxieties that Cairo gives expression in a variety of ways and by a variety of cries ; cries which, so far as can be observed, affect the indwelling character of Egypt, expressed as it is by the unchanging rhythm of her rural life, much as the Sphinx is affected by the suppression of a Cairo newspaper or by a regimental change in the army of occupation.

### III

## FURTHER NOTES ON "ALI BABA AND THE FORTY THIEVES"

By DUNCAN B. MACDONALD

**I**T is now possible for me to supplement my Arabic text of *Ali Baba* by printing in full the only other original version so far known. I shall add some further information which I have gathered on the identity of the scribe of the Bodleian MS. and various notes on the text of that version. Besides the criticisms of Professor Torrey, printed in this *Journal* for 1911 (pp. 221 ff.), I have had the advantage of privately communicated suggestions from Professor Goldziher, Artin Pasha, and Joseph Gabriel, Esq., a native of Haşbaya in the Lebanon, but now for many years in business in Manchester. His communications have been of especial interest.

In his *Histoire d'Alâ al-Dîn Zotenberg* gives various extracts from Galland's diary, including abstracts of different stories. But unfortunately among these are only two or three lines from the beginning of the abstract of the story of Ali Baba. I now give it entire, preserving Galland's orthography and even the passages which he himself had struck out. In a case such as this absolute exactitude and completeness are called for.<sup>1</sup>

[Bibl. Nat., MS. fr. 19277, p. 140.]

### LES FINESSES DE MORGIANE OU LES QUARANTE VOLEURS EXTERMINÉS PAR L'ADDRESSSE D'UNE ENCLAVE

Dans une ville de la Perse vers les confins des Indes  
il y avoit deux frères, l'un fort riche, gros marchand bien

<sup>1</sup> I am indebted for this transcript to the kindness of Miss Mand Temple, M.A., of Radcliffe College, Harvard, and to the care and skill of M. Max Courteousier, of the Bibliothèque Ste Geneviève. Galland's hand, in his diary at least, is a most lamentable scribble and calls for intense decipherment. M. Courteousier added modern punctuation.

logé, et l'autre pauvre pèlerin gagnant sa vie à aller couper du bois dans une forêt voisine : l'un (le premier, *var.*) se nommait Caseem et l'autre (*var.* celui-ci) Hogia Baba. Hogia Baba se trouva un jour à son ordinaire dans la même forêt avec trois ânes, et il aperçut de loin une grosse troupe de gens qui excitoient un nuage de poussière à cheval et qui venoient droit à lui. Il monta sur un gros arbre. La poussière à leur approche se dissipa et il vit quarante cavaliers, grands, bien armés ; ils mirent pied à terre, lièrent (*var.* laissèrent paître) leurs chevaux aux environs à des bras du gros arbre. Il y avoit un grand rocher : les voleurs s'avancèrent jusqu'à une porte cachée, etc. . . si près de l'arbre que Hogia Baba entendit celui qui estoit le premier prononcer ces paroles : 'Sésame, ouvre-toi' Aussitôt la porte s'ouvrit : ils y entrèrent, la porte se ferma, ils y demeurèrent un long espace de tems, ils en sortirent. Quand ils furent tous dehors, le dernier se retourna et en se retournant il prononça ces paroles : 'Sésame, ferme-toi' et la porte se referma. Ils remontèrent à cheval. Quand ils furent éloignés, Hogia Baba descendit, se présenta devant la porte, prononça les mêmes paroles : la porte s'ouvrit la porte se ferma et à la chance de la lumière qui venoit d'une chambre il trouva la table mise et beaucoup de provisions, de vivres des amas de riches choses etc et surtout de l'argent et de l'or pu tas etc. C'estoit une retraite de voleurs depuis un très long tems. Ils alloient voler au loins, venoient apporter leur butin de tems<sup>1</sup> et s'abstenoient de faire aucun mal aux environs, etc. . . . Le bûcheron charge ses trois ânes d'or et de bois par dessus dans des sacs qu'il trouva parmi les meubles et il retourne à la ville, il rentre chez lui dans une petite cour, ferme la porte et décharge les ânes, porte les sacs dans la maison, sa femme vient toute étonnée, soupçonne que son mari est un voleur. . . Hogia Baba lui impose

<sup>1</sup> De temps en temps (?).

silence et lui raconte le fait. La femme veut compter l'or. Le mari lui dit qu'elle est une sotte, que cela ne sert de rien ; elle veut au moins le mesurer. Le mari cède, la laisse faire, elle va chercher une mesure chez Cassem frère du mari : la femme de Cassem lui en prète *une surprise*.<sup>1</sup> Comme elle savoit leur pauvreté, curieuse de savoir quel grain elle vouloit mesurer, elle frotte le dessous de la mesure, de graisse. La femme va mesurer l'or, elle sçait le nombre de la mesure qu'elle avoit posée sur le tas d'or. Pendant que son mari entout l'argent dans un endroit de la maison, elle reporte la mesure à sa belle-sœur qui regarde le dessous et y trouve une pièce d'or attachée. Le soir, au retour du *mari* Cassem, elle lui fait le récit. Le lendemain Cassem avide qui ne se contente pas de va trouver son frère veut savoir où il a pris tant d'argent le menace de le dénoncer. *Le frère fait tout ce qu'il peut pour l'appaiser il offre de lui en faire part, il veut savoir.* Il lui raconte la chose comme elle est et il offre de lui en faire part. Le frère veut sçavoir l'endroit, les enseignes. Hogia Baba fait difficultés : il est contraint de le satisfaire. Cassem le lendemain va à la forest avec dix mulets, il trouve *la forest* l'endroit, prononce les paroles, la porte s'ouvre il entre, elle se referme, il voit le . . . Quand il veut sortir pour charger ses mulets, il ne se souvient plus des paroles, tant it estoit occupé de ce qu'il venoit de voir il trouve plusieurs sortes de grains, etc. Les voleurs surviennent, ils sont étonnés et ne peuvent comprendre ils le mettent par quartiers et chaque quartier d'un costé et de l'autre de l'escalier par où l'on descendoit . . . et tronc du corps. Ils sortent après avoir mangé et ferment la porte. Le soir quand la femme de Cassem voit que son mari n'est pas revenu, vient à Hogia Baba, redemande son mari, crie, etc. . . . Hogia Baba l'appaise, lui disant qu'il peut revenir la nuit, etc. . . . Le lendemain elle fait plus de bruit. Hogia

<sup>1</sup> Words in italics are struck out in the text.

Baba reprend ses trois ânes, retourne à la forest, etc. . . . ; il arrive à la grotte, il prononce les paroles, la porte s'ouvre et il voit l'estat où est son frère : il charge son âne d'or, du corps en plusieurs sacs avec de l'or, couvre le tout de bois, revient, raconte à sa belle-sœur : *elle se met à faire des cris* la prévient pour empêcher ses cris en lui offrant de la prendre pour femme avec la sienne ; elle y consent. Pour cacher la chose, Morgiane dès le même jour va demander des tablettes propres pour les malades qui sont en danger, dans le voisinage. Le lendemain elle fait la même chose pour demander d'une essence pour dernier remède. Le soir elle fait la pleureuse. Le jour d'après, de grand matin, elle va à la place et elle s'adresse à un vieux savetier qui avoit ouvert avant les autres, commence à lui donner une pièce d'or : Bonne estraine ! que voulez-vous de moi ? Elle lui dit qu'elle veut lui fermer les yeux à un certain endroit. Il fait le difficile. Elle lui donne une autre pièce d'or : il se laisse mener, elle lui ferme les yeux et elle le mène chez son maître, elle lui monstre quoi il s'agit. Il fait difficulté, elle promet une autre pièce d'or : il coud etc. Elle le ramène les yeux bandés, elle lui oste le bandeau et il retourne chez lui. On va avertir à la mosquée pour l'enterrement et ce pendant Morgiane ensevelit le mort. Les ministres de la mosquée en arrivant veulent laver le corps, Morgiane dit que la chose est faite, on conduit. Morgiane suit devant [*sic*] en s'arrachant les cheveux, etc. . . . Le frère suit le corps, les voisins l'accompagnent en criant à la mode du pays, etc. . . . Le frère Hogia Baba va demeurer dans la maison de son frère, transporte son argent pendant la nuit, etc. . . . Il avoit un fils qui ocupe la boutique de son oncle etc. . . . Les voleurs reviennent quelque tem après. Étonnés de ne plus trouver le corps et le tas d'or plus diminué qu'auparavant, le capitaine les excite à la vengeance et propose récompense ou la mort à celui qui découvrira la demeure. Un se présente, il

change d'habit, il va à la ville et il s'adresse d'un (1) grand matin au savetier. Il lui demande, le voyant si vieux s'il voit encore clair et s'il pourroit bien coudre : "J'ai bien cousu un mort !" Le voleur se réjouit, il lui donne une pièce d'or, il demande l'adresse. Il lui marque qu'il ne le peut à cause de ses yeux qu'on lui avoit bandé les yeux. "Vous pouvez bien vous souv. [sic] souvenir du chemin que vous avez fait : venez je vous banderai les yeux, etc. . . ." Argent mis en main il accompagne le voleur et trouve la maison. Le voleur marque la porte de craie, etc. . . . Morgiane sort de la maison : en revenant elle apperçoit la marque, elle prend de la craie et marque de même les autres portes de l'un et de l'autre côté à droite et à gauche. Le voleur cependant va avertir les voleurs, etc. . . . ils viennent à la ville, ils se dispersent, le voleur et le capitaine passent . . . de jour pour reconnoître, il voit plusieurs portes marquées de mesme, etc. . . . il s'en retourne avec les autres voleurs et celui qui avoit mal réussi est puni. Un second se présente, etc. . . . il va s'adresser au mesme savetier qui lui fait connoître la maison de la mesme manière, il la marque la porte de rouge en un autre endroit moins apparent. Morgiane s'en apperçoit et marque les autres portes au mesme endroit. Le voleur est puni comme l'autre. Le capitaine se charge de la chose lui-mesme : il vient à la ville déguisé en marchand, loue une boutique. Il apprend du mesme savetier la maison et le nom de Hoyia Babu, et il se trouve que sa boutique est vis à vis du fils. Il fait amitié avec le fils, il le régale plusieurs fois, familiarité. Le fils veut le regaler à son tour. Il apprend la maison par le mesme savetier : il la remarque bien et retourne à la forest, et à la grotte ; il fait provision d'autant de grands vases de cuir à mettre de l'huile qu'il a d'hommes, il les enferme dans chacun dans un de ces vases qu'il frotte d'huile, et il en emplit un d'huile. Il les charge sur des mulets, il se met en chemin, et il arrive



devant la maison d'Hogia Baba, sur la bonne. *Le matin* il estoit à sa porte où il prenoit l'air après le soupé. Le capitaine des voleurs le prie de vouloir bien lui donner entrée dans sa cour pour passer la nuit. Non seulement il l'accorde, il ordonne qu'on mette les chevaux dans l'écurie, qu'on leur donne orge, foin. Les vases sont déchargés dans la cour, on fait souper le capitaine. Après le souper il va à chaque vase et il avertit les voleurs *que* quand il de fendre les vases avec les couteaux dont ils estoient munis, quand il jetteroit de petites pierres pour les avertir. On lui donne une chambre pour se coucher. Hogia Baba avant de se coucher recommande à Morgiane de lui tenir son linge du bain prest pour y aller avant le jour et de lui préparer un bouillon pour son retour. Morgiane met le pot au feu et la chandelle manque. Un domestique lui dit de prendre de l'huile dans un des vases qui estoient dans la cour, etc. *Elle* Au premier vase le voleur qui estoit dedans demande en parlant bas s'il estoit tems. Par sa pénétration elle répond que non mais bientôt. Elle va à tous et elle trouve la mesme chose. Le vase d'huile estoit le dernier en rang, elle prend de l'huile pour allumer la lampe et elle en rem [se] remplit une chaudière qu'elle fait bien bouillir avec de la porx, elle en verse dans chaque vase de la toute bouillante et fait périr tous les voleurs etc. Le capitaine jette des pierres, personne ne répond, il descend et il trouve tous les voleurs; il se sauve de maison en maison. Hogia Baba revient du bain, il apprend ce qui s'est passé il fait enterrer les voleurs dans son jardin trouve le moien de vendre les mulets, etc.

Le capitaine des voleurs demeuré seul se déguise en marchand; il loue une boutique vis à vis de celle d'Hogia Baba, il fait amitié avec lui, grande familiarité: il le régale plusieurs fois. Le fils veut avoir sa revanche, il en parle à son père qui y consent. Morgiane prépare le soupé. Le fils arrive, le faux marchand, on se met

à table. Le Cap. s'excuse de manger en s'excusant sur ce qu'il ne mangeoit ni pain ni viande ni ragoût où il y eût du sel. Baba Hogia tient fait venir Morgiane, il lui commande de faire incessamment du pain et quelque ragoust sans sel. Morgiane se doute de la méchanceté, à cause que le sel est marque d'amitié et qu'on ne fait aucun tort dès qu'on en a mangé. On soupe ; après le souper, danseurs, etc. . . . Morgiane prend un masque, le baïonnette au costé, danse la dernière et se fait admirer. A la fin, elle s'approche de Hogia Baba qui lui donne un nombre de pièces d'or, elle s'approche de mesme du fils qui fait la mesme chose. Elle enfonce le poignard dans le sein du faux marchand. Hogia Baba s'écrie, elle l'appaise en faisant voir de quelle manière le Cap. des voleurs estoit armé. Louange de Morgiane, il la donne en mariage à son fils. Le bruit se respand de la mort, il fait connoître en déguisant ce qu'il falloit déguiser. A différent fois, il tira tout ce qu'il y avoit d'or et d'argent, hardes, etc. . . . en cachette. Ils vivent heureux et contents, etc. . . .

Probably no one who reads the above will have any question that Galland, when writing his *Ali Baba* two years and three months after this entry in his diary, must have had some other written source. But what was that source, and what relation did it bear to the Bodleian Arabic version? Some of Galland's MSS. must have gone astray after his death—that, for example, containing Hanna's transcript of *Aladdin*. Among these might easily be a form of *Ali Baba* which, like Hanna's *Aladdin*, has not yet turned up. But from the other end I can now go a step further back and fix the scribe of the Bodleian MS. I have already noted in this *Journal* (April, 1910, p. 328) that *Yūḥannā* is a Christian form, but that the wording of the colophon is Muslim, or, at any rate, not specifically Christian. There is also the *Basmala* at the beginning, which a native Christian would not have used. The

suggestion of a European scribe therefore rises at once. The only other occurrence of واری which I can find is in Pertach's Gotha Catalogue, vol. v, p. 32, where a MS. is described bearing the same stamp (V.L.) and a note in Arabic script: [منه] القير الى ربي [منه] القدير عبد الله حنا واری سنة 1208

The two *nic*'s were inserted by Pertach—who also notes that he knows no other case of واری—but Artin Pasha suggests to me that the first word means “by purchase” and that *ulif* and *lum* have come together being looped above. This volume was bought from the same bookseller, Franck, from whom the Bodleian procured its MS., and was No. 458 in his catalogue.<sup>1</sup> That catalogue, here inaccessible to me, would be well worth looking up, but, in the meantime, I do not hesitate to guess that یوحنا واری is Jean Vary, of whom there are traces as a pupil of de Sacy's. In the library of the École des langues orientales there is a copy by him, finished in December, 1807, of the first redaction of de Sacy's Arabic grammar. See a note on p. xvi of the biography of de Sacy by Hartwig Derenbourg prefixed to the collected edition of de Sacy's papers, the publication of which was begun by George Salmon, Cairo, 1905. Further de Sacy refers to him in his *Chrestomathie arabe* (2nd ed i pp 176, 195) as in business at Alexandria and Marseilles. He contributed scattered notes also to the *Journal Asiatique* the last apparently in 1850.

This identification seems sufficiently to rule out Professor Torrey's suggestion (this *Journal*, 1911, p. 222) that the scribe was also the author of this recension. No pupil of de Sacy's would have so jumbled *naḥw* and *dārīj* together, but might easily have transcribed them.

<sup>1</sup> A. Franck, *Catalogue d'une belle collection de manuscrits et livres arabes* . . . Paris, 1890.

Of course I do not think that the original of the recensor is many removes from this MS., but I feel compelled to posit an educated native Arabic speaker as such a one would make grammatical errors exactly as in this MS. The original writing (عربي) for العربي (p. 268) is something inconceivable in any one who was of the school of de Saey. For it should be remembered even the educated Arabic speaker cannot write *nahwi*. Even—so far is *nahwi* from any living form of language—a practiced author will seek the assistance of a professional grammarian to revise his work. And further, in spite of Professor Torrey's remarks (this *Journal* 1911, p. 226) I still hold that he prided himself on his *crab*. He was writing, it should be remembered before the modern popular story literature had appeared. His models were on the one hand, current MSS. of the *Nights* and the like and on the other, such works as Ibn Arabshāh's different treatments of the *Marzubān Nāmā*. As for MSS. of the *Nights* and the like, no one who has not worked at them can have any idea of the corruptness of their style<sup>1</sup>. Our printed editions, with the exception of Habicht's have all been carefully grammaticalized by learned editors and the same holds in great part even of the MSS. which Habicht used. Ibn an Nazzār and his other copyists touched them up. It is in Ibn Arabshāh and his *Fakihāt al-khulafā* that we find the real models for our present writer. Let the two different treatments by Ibn 'Arabshāh of the stories of the *Marzubān Nāmā* be compared, the simple translation (lithographed at Cairo, A. H. 1278) and the ornate, rhetorical amplification in the *Fakihāt*, and the kinship of our MS. with the second will at once stand out. Our author wished

<sup>1</sup> From this must be excepted the Galland and the Vatican MSS. and two or three other old MSS., such as those at Tübingen. These rest on a true literary tradition which, apart from them, has long been lost.

to write *nahwī* and so had to *i'rab* as far as was in his power, and the mere fact that he attempted such a redaction shows that he thought such a style and learning within his reach. The difference between the language and manner of the ordinary story and the literary *genre* which he was attempting must have been clear to him. On that account I altered بکایکی (p. 340, l. 4 from foot). The form would have been normal in an ordinary MS. of the *Nights*, and should be retained in an edition of the *Nights*, but in this MS. it is the one occurrence and as much to be corrected, as a scribal slip, as if it occurred in the *Fākiha* or in *Hariri*. On the other hand, I retained that impossibility فقط (p. 352, l. 12; p. 357, l. 12) because it occurred twice and seemed explicable as an attempt at *i'rab*ing, perhaps on the so frequent analogy of ابدأ. Professor Torrey (p. 226) calls فقط "a characteristic vulgarity". If he means that it is a characteristic grammatical slip I agree with him. But if he means that it actually occurs in the colloquial, then I have no knowledge of such usage, and I have looked carefully for it. I understand further from him by letter that he can quote no occurrence of it.

The same method had to be applied to all the other slips and usages in the MS., such as the orthography of *hemza* and of the verbs final *wa* and *ya*, the confusion of ج and ح, etc. In each case the question had to be asked, was such and such a usage thinkable in the case of this redactor or must it be a transcriber's blunder? The MS. was evidently very careful and correct, and to be followed wherever any excuse was possible. Thus I retained (p. 353, l. 19) بالنعش for بالناحش, as ع and ح are liable to confusion in the dialects, and حرم (p. 377, l. 4 from foot) for the more usual محرم, as it was a possible form. Similarly, I retained افشى for افشا (p. 389, l. 14).

for it was quite conceivable to me that the original redactor had so written, and استبطه (p. 340, l. 14) for the same reason. Why Professor Torrey objects (p. 223) to my noting that the classical root is بَطَّ I do not understand. Similarly, on p. 348, l. 15, I have followed the MS. with سودَّ for سوداه.

I add now a list of misprints, more numerous than I care to think of. Some of them may easily be slips in my "printer's copy". in any case I am responsible for them. The most of the corrections I owe to Professors Goldziher and Torrey.

P. 341, l. 6, read سعادده ; p. 346, l. 2, الملعون ; p. 347, l. 9, احمران ; p. 351, l. 8, الشيخ ; p. 352, l. 10, فرايصه ; p. 356, l. 12, الجاسوس ; p. 358, l. 10, للمس (in MS.); p. 359, l. 2, عجز عن ; p. 360, l. 4 from foot, وسكنت ; p. 361, l. 2 from foot, اوفى ; p. 361, l. 14, الى ان ; p. 364, l. 11, عرفه ; p. 367, l. 8, والاضطجاع ; p. 372, l. 10, تشربها ; p. 374, l. 6, الورطة . p. 375, l. 3 from foot, الكبار ; p. 378, l. 1, فيقتضى . p. 381, l. 1, فاكلوا , p. 384, l. 5, ويطش .

I now enter on some more dubious corrections. P. 344, last line, the MS. reads كلما twice, and, though the reading is hard, the general care of the MS. seemed to require its retention. P. 347, l. 16, the manuscript reading is المانع as I printed, and I can see no reason for changing it to المانع as Professor Torrey suggests. Something evidently had hindered Qāsim. P. 358, l. 12, the manuscript reading is المحروم as I printed; I take it to mean "unhappy". (Of course, المرحوم would be an "easier" reading. On p. 359, last two lines and note, the 2nd person suits the context as well as the 1st, and I am afraid I must ask Professor Torrey for some occurrences of وا as a termination to a 1st person plural imperfect in eastern Arabic.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Of course, it is a common termination in Maghribi Arabic from Tripoli westward.

On p. 363, l. 4 from foot, the MS. reads **فروب** as printed. It is good Arabic for "kinds, species", and, though **ابواب** follows, is quite defensible. Dogmatism is hardly in place. Similarly, on p. 366, l. 14, I read with the MS. **وعلى**, and understand it to mean that he hung *'altique* or fodder-sacks on the necks of his beasts (Lane, 2136c). On p. 382, l. 3, it is certainly alluring to read, as Professor Torrey suggests, **حزها** for **هزها**. But the MS. reads clearly as I printed, and there are so many possibilities in the word—time, condition, dress (Lane, Dozy)—that I hesitate to change.

On the other hand, I have no question that in the following cases Professor Torrey is right. P. 361, l. 15, pronounce **يَنَّاكُ**; p. 358, l. 10, **خطى** is a verb; p. 370, l. 11, read (with the MS.) **فبعد قربه**. As to the meaning of **على حال** (p. 367, l. 10) I am still in doubt.

Of the curious usage on p. 354, l. 1, Professors Goldziher and Torrey and Mr. Gabriel hold each a different view. Professor Goldziher (by letter) suggests the reading **واستقى**. My difficulty lies in the tenth stem and the construction with **ب**: also she was a widow. Professor Torrey suggests (this *Journal*, 1911, p. 228) **واستقى بها**, translating "and he appeared with her before the qadi" and comparing p. 384, l. 21. Mr. Gabriel (by letter) retains the manuscript reading and connects the usage with **فائى**, "an empty place," and renders "he cohabited with her".

Mr. Gabriel has further given me some very interesting notes on the dialect lying behind this, which I must still call a pseudo-grammatical retelling of a *Märchen*, and on its actual occurrence as a *Märchen*. To his mind it is "in correct Arabic, but with a good many slang words and some mistakes". The dialect is Syrian; against that view he does not give any weight to its occasional use of **ج** for **ج**. But there are two curious exceptions. On

p. 342, l. 1, **مننا** is certainly Egyptian, and on p. 382, l. 9, **ماسكاد** is Egyptian or Bedawi. On these and other points he had consulted a native Egyptian.

As to the *Märchen*, he remembers hearing it as a boy at his native place Hachbaya in the Lebanon before 1860, the year in which he left home. Both parts of the story were told to him there, and he remembers the following details: (1) The name Ali Baba; contrast Hogia Baba in Galland's diary. (2) The forty thieves were called **اربعين ازعر**. (3) They were not concealed in skins (**قرب**) but in **خوابی**, jars (sing. **خابية**). For a man concealed in a water-skin see Bayle St. John's *Two Years in a Levantine Family*, ch. xxi, and for soldiers hidden in jars Moret's *In the time of the Pharaohs*, p. 97.

Artin Pasha (by letter) lays stress upon Baba as indicating ultimate Turkish origin, and points out that Ali Baba must have been a dervish. All the Bektashite dervishes are called Baba. In this sense the word is the equivalent of the Greek **παππας**.

Finally, Ali Baba has returned to the East, translated from some form of Galland, in **كيف تفكك اوروبا**, Cairo, 2nd ed., pp. 69-91.





#### IV

### THE GOAL OF MUHAMMADAN MYSTICISM<sup>1</sup>

By REYNOLD A. NICHOLSON

**T**HE title of this paper suggests a definite answer to a definite question. I do not think that such an answer can be given except in very general terms. The mystics of Islam, like all other mystics, recognize that the object of their search cannot be apprehended by knowledge, much less described by words. The goal is ineffable: all that can be done is to describe the journey from beginning to end. This is no easy task, and would assuredly be a long one if we accept the view of a celebrated Persian theosophist that the ways to God are in number as the souls of men. It is possible, however, to reduce to a system the main features, both theoretical and practical, of any mystical type and with the help of a highly developed symbolism to indicate in some degree what is the nature of those experiences which lie beyond thought and knowledge. My present purpose is to discuss the meanings attached by Sûfis to certain metaphorical terms which are used in reference to the state of union with God. A Moslem, as well as a Christian, might speak of union with God, but the former would be more likely, perhaps, to describe the consummation of the mystic life as "extinction in the Real" (*fanâ fi 'l-haqq*). The term *fanâ*, which has been rendered by "passing away" or "annihilation", plays a great part in Sûfî literature, and

<sup>1</sup> This paper was read at the Fourth International Congress for the History of Religions held at Leiden, September 9-13, 1912. I have added the original text of the passages quoted in translation.

is familiar to European students, but its history has not yet been sufficiently investigated. Fresh light is thrown upon it by texts which have recently been discovered or made accessible. The first Persian manual of Sufism, the *Kashf al-Mahjûb*, can now be read in an English translation, and two copies have come to England of an earlier work that was believed to have been lost, probably, the oldest surviving treatise on the subject in Arabic, the *Kitâb al-Luma'* by Abû Naṣr al-Sarrâj, who died in 378 A.H. (988-9 A.D.). As I am preparing an edition of the *Kitâb al-Luma'* for publication in the Gibb Memorial Series, I need only say that it contains much valuable information which is not to be found elsewhere and that it especially adds to our knowledge of the pantheistic and ecstatic aspects of Sufism. The author in several places explains his conception of *fana'*, and I will now quote some of these passages, which are important both on account of their early date and because the book is often cited as an authority by Qushayrî and subsequent writers. Explanations of mystical terms are hard to understand and still harder to translate, so I must claim your indulgence if I have failed in either respect. In choosing an English phrase equivalent to *fana'* one has to consider its correlative term, *baqâ*, which expresses just the opposite meaning. *Baqâ* signifies "continuance" and the opposite of "continuance" is not "extinction" or "annihilation", but "transience" or "passing away". Therefore, although *fana'* does imply the meaning of annihilation and extinction "passing away" would seem to be a more exact rendering of the term.

- According to the author of the *Luma'* the original meaning of *fana'* and *baqâ* is the passing away of ignorance through the continuance of knowledge, the passing away of disobedience through the continuance of obedience, the passing away of forgetting (God) through the continuance of remembering (Him), the passing away of regarding

human actions through the continuance of regarding God's providence in His eternal foreknowledge.<sup>1</sup>

In another place he says "The meaning of *fana* is the passing away of the attributes of the lower soul (*nafs*) and, the passing away of repugnance to, and reliance on, anything that may happen. *Baqi* denotes continuance in this condition. Again, *fand* is the passing away of a man's regarding in his actions that which he does, through God's taking his place therein."<sup>2</sup>

The term *dhakab*, "going away," is nearly synonymous with *fand*, and signifies, our author says, "the going away of the mind from perception of sensible objects through the contemplation of that which it beholds, then the mind goes away from its going away and this is infinite. To one in this state all things are non-existent and nothing is perceived by the senses."<sup>3</sup>

Al Sarraj describes *fana* as a gradual process. He enumerates the following five steps:

1. The vanishing of his consciousness of the present life and the future life through the coming over him of the thought of God.

2. The vanishing of his consciousness of thinking of God in his consciousness of God's thinking of him.

وَمَعْنَى الْمَيِّتِ وَالْمَيِّتِ فِي أَوَّلِهِ مَيِّتٌ أَحْمَرٌ حَمَاءٌ أَعْمَى  
وَمَيِّتٌ الْمَعْنَى بِقَاءِ الطَّاعَةِ وَمَيِّتٌ الْعَيْنِ بِمَيِّتِ الذِّكْرِ وَمَيِّتٌ حَرَكَةُ  
الْعَدِّ لِمَيِّتِ رُؤْيَا عَدَايَةِ اللَّهِ تَعَالَى فِي سَائِلِ الْعَدِّ

وَمَعْنَى الْمَيِّتِ مَيِّتٌ مَعْنَى النُّفْسِ وَمَيِّتٌ الْمَصْرُوحِ وَالْمَصْرُوحِ  
إِلَى حَالٍ وَقَعَ وَالْمَيِّتِ نَقَاءُ الْعَدِّ عَلَى ذَنْكَ وَأَيْتٌ هُوَ مَيِّتٌ  
رُؤْيَا الْعَدِّ فِي أَعْمَالِهِ لِأَعْمَالِهِ تَقِيَامُ اللَّهُ لَهُ فِي ذَنْكَ

وهو ذهاب القلب عن حسي المحسوسات بمشاهدة  
ما شاهد ثم يذهب عن ذهابه والذهاب عن لذهاب هذا ما لا  
بهاية له . . . يعنى قد غابت المحاسن وتلقت الاشياء فليس يوجد  
شيء ولا يحس .

<sup>1</sup> *Lum*, 1536 وهو ذهاب القلب عن حسي المحسوسات بمشاهدة

3. The passing away of regarding God's thought of him, so that only his consciousness of God remains.

4. The vanishing of his consciousness of God through regarding his consciousness.

5. The vanishing of his consciousness of regarding his consciousness through the passing away of passing away and the continuance of continuance.<sup>1</sup>

Although these definitions are expressed in technical language, I think their purport will be tolerably clear to anyone conversant with other forms of mysticism. But not only does our author explain what *fanâ* is, he also tells us what, in his opinion, it is not. In two chapters headed respectively "the passing away of qualities" and "the passing away of humanity" he criticizes theories of *fanâ* which were current in his time.

"Some mystics of Baghdâd," he says, 'have erred in their doctrine that when they pass away from their qualities they enter into the qualities of God. This involves incarnation (*hulûl*) or leads to the Christian belief concerning Jesus.<sup>2</sup> The doctrine in question has been attributed to some of the ancients, but its true meaning is this, that when a man goes forth from his own qualities and enters into the qualities of God, he goes forth from his own will, which is a gift to him from God, and enters into the will of God, knowing that his will is given to him by God and that by virtue of this gift he is severed from regarding himself and becomes entirely devoted to God, and this is one of the stages of Unitarians. Those who

فأول علامة الخاسي ذهاب حظه من الدنيا والآخرة : *Imma*, 97a :  
 بورود ذكر الله تعالى ثم ذهاب حظه من ذكر الله تعالى عند حظه  
 بذكر الله تعالى له ثم يعني رؤية ذكر الله تعالى له حتى يبقی  
 حظه بالله ثم ذهاب حظه من الله تعالى برؤية حظه ثم ذهاب  
 حظه برؤية حظه بقاء البقاء .

<sup>1</sup> Cf. my translation of the *Kashf al-Maghrib*, p. 338.

have erred in this doctrine have failed to observe that the qualities of God are not God. To make God identical with His qualities is to be guilty of infidelity, because God does not descend into the heart, but that which descends into the heart is faith in God and belief in His unity and reverence for the thought of Him."<sup>1</sup>

It will be noticed that the author does not condemn the doctrine of the passing away of human qualities, which, indeed, forms part of his own explanation of *fanā*: he only rejects what seems to him a dangerous interpretation of the doctrine.

The second heresy, "the passing away of humanity," is criticized as follows:

"Some have abstained from food and drink, fancying that when a man's body is weakened it is possible that he may lose his humanity and be invested with the attributes of divinity. The ignorant persons who hold this erroneous doctrine cannot distinguish between humanity and the

و قد علقت جماعه من المعددين في قلوبهم انهم  
عند فناهم عن اوصافهم دخلوا في اوصاف الحق وقد اصابوا اسمهم  
جهلهم الى معنى يتوهم ذلك في المحلول او الى معناه 'تصاري  
في المسيح عم وقد زعم انه سمع بعض المتقدمين 'ووجد في كلامهم  
انه قال في معنى الفناء عن الاوصاف والدخول في اوصاف الحق  
والمعنى الصحيح من ذلك ان الارادة تستعد وهي من عند الله  
عطية ومعنى خروج العبد من اوصافه والدخول في اوصاف الحق  
خروجه من ارادته ودخوله في ارادة الحق وبمعنى ان يعلم ان  
الارادات هي عطية من الله تعالى وبمشتته شاء وبفصله جعل له  
ما بعطية ذلك قطعه عن رؤية نفسه حتى يقطع بكنيته الى الله  
تعالى وذلك منزل من منازل اهل التوحيد واقا الذين غلطوا في  
هذا المعنى انما غلطوا بدقسيقة خفيت عليهم حتى ظنوا ان  
اوصاف الحق هو الحق وهذا كله كفر لان الله تعالى لا يخل في القلوب  
ولكن يخل في القلوب الايمان به والتوحيد له **والله اعلم**

inborn qualities (*akhlāq*) of humanity. Humanity does not depart from man any more than blackness departs from that which is black or whiteness from that which is white, but the inborn qualities of humanity are changed and transmuted by the all-powerful radiance that is shed upon them from the Divine Realities. The attributes of humanity are not the essence of humanity. Those who inculcate the doctrine of *faná* mean the passing away of regarding one's own actions and works of devotion through the continuance of regarding God as the doer of these actions on behalf of His servant."<sup>1</sup>

We are now in a position to formulate the notion of *faná* as explained by the author of the *Kitāb al-Lumá*. Substantially the same explanation is given by Qushayri,<sup>2</sup> whose classical apology for Sūfism was published sixty years after the death of al-Sarrāj, and also by the author of the *Kashf al-Mahjūb*,<sup>3</sup> a contemporary of Qushayri. All these writers endeavour to show that Sūfism is thoroughly orthodox, and assert that its doctrines, rightly understood, are nothing but the true esoteric science contained in the Koran and the Traditions of the Prophet. The following summary of their *faná* theory represents the views of a large and influential party which, ever

فمنهم من ترك الطعام والشراب ونحوهم أن البشرية  
هي الغالب والحقبة اذا غلبت زالت بشريتها فيجوز ان يكون  
مومونا بصفات "لاهية" وهم يحسن هذه التفرقة الجاهلة الفاسدة ان  
تفرق بين البشرية وبين اخلاق البشرية لأن البشرية لا تزول عن  
البشر كما ان لون الاسود لا يزول عن الاسود ولا لون الابيض عن  
الابيض واخلاق البشرية تبدل وتغير بما يريد عليها من سلطان الثواب  
العقوبات وصفات البشرية ليست هي عين البشرية والذي اشار الى  
الغناء اراد به فناء رؤيا الاعمال والطاعات بقاء رؤيا العبد لقيام  
العمل القليل بذلك

<sup>1</sup> *Lumá*, 180a: البشرية : فممنهم من ترك الطعام والشراب ونحوهم أن البشرية

<sup>2</sup> *Risalat* (Cairo, 1318 A.H.), 43, 43-45, 1.

<sup>3</sup> pp. 249-5 of my translation.

since the time of Ghazālī, has been the driving religious force in Islam.

*Faḥḥ*, then, involves—

1. A moral transformation of the soul through the extinction of all its passions and desires. The passing away of evil qualities and of the evil actions which they produce is said to be brought about by the continuance of the corresponding good qualities and actions. This means that when ignorance, for example, passes away, knowledge remains, and that when a man ceases to forget God he necessarily continues to remember Him.

2. A mental abstraction or passing away of the mind from all objects of perception, thoughts, actions, and feelings through its concentration upon the thought of God. Here the thought of God signifies contemplation of the Divine attributes.

3. The cessation of all conscious thought. The highest stage of *fahḥ* is reached when even the consciousness of having attained *fahḥ* disappears. This is what Sūfīs call 'the passing away of passing away' (*fahḥ al-fahḥ*). The mystic is now rapt in contemplation of the Divine essence.<sup>1</sup>

Often though not invariably, *fahḥ* is accompanied by loss of sensation. Sūrī al-Saqatī, a famous Sūfī of the third century, expressed the opinion that if a man in this state were struck on the face with a sword he would not feel the blow.<sup>2</sup> Abū 'l-Khayr al-Aqṭa' had a gangrene in

<sup>1</sup> Qushayrī, 41, 12, distinguishes three stages of *fahḥ* similar to those described above. The *first* is "passing away from the 'self' and its qualities through continuance in the qualities of God"; the *second* is "passing away from the qualities of God through contemplation of God"; and the *third* is "passing away from the contemplation of passing away through annihilation (*istihlāk*) in the being of God". The last words are remarkable as showing that a comparatively orthodox Sūfī could use the language of pure pantheism, but they show, too, the danger of understanding mystical expressions in their literal and obvious sense. Qushayrī refers to the unconscious absorption of thought and will in contemplation of the Divine being.

<sup>2</sup> *Longue*, 1024.





of man's being in God's being—and, using an illustration which occurs in the *Enneads* of Plotinus, he likens it to the melting of iron in fire: fire, he says, affects only the quality of iron without changing its substance.<sup>1</sup>

The contradiction, though disguised by scholastic subtleties, goes fatally deep, and it is not surprising that in their extremity the theologians should have turned to philosophy. The results of this alliance have been set forth with admirable clearness by Mr. Whinfield,<sup>2</sup> and I need not dwell upon them here. Neoplatonism supplied the metaphysical foundation of the new system. Allah was identified with the Neoplatonic One, in which all real being is included. On the other hand, all unreal being—the world of phenomena and man—is “matter” or “not-being”, which only appears to exist through reflecting real being and thereby borrowing a sort of phantasmal reality. Man belongs to both worlds. On one side the baser elements of his nature attach him to the shows and apparitions of this life, but his true being is the divine spark in the ground of his soul, in virtue of which he is essentially one with God. Is he not, then, above law and religion? The answer is, that law and religion are necessary bonds, so long as man is associated with not-being, which is the source of evil.

While the older theory of *fanû* depended on the theological conception of God as absolute will, the theory which we are now considering starts from the philosophical idea of God as absolute being. That from which the mystic of this school strives to pass away is the phenomenal universe, including all that is unreal in himself. Probably, however, his aspirations will not be expressed with such cold propriety. Mysticism is neither philosophy nor

<sup>1</sup> *Kashf al-Majîb*, 245.

<sup>2</sup> See the introduction to his edition of the *Qulûb-i Rûi*, by Mahmûd Shahrîzî, and compare my *Selections from the Diwân-i Shams-i Tabrîz*, no. 27-8 of the introduction.

theology' nor both together. It can turn these sciences to account, as we have seen, but no sooner has it absorbed them than they suffer, like Alonso in Ariel's song,

"A sea-change  
Into something rich and strange."

It is generally accepted that Sūfism—the pantheistic movement in Islam—was the result of many co-operating circumstances. The course of theological speculation, and the inevitable revolt against its inhumanly rigid formalism, was one cause. Another was the influence of Greek and Indian theosophy. How to prevent the new wine from bursting the old bottles, how to control the mighty torrent which menaced Islam with destruction and break its force by diverting it into the well-worn traditional channels—this was the problem that faced Muhammadan religious thinkers in the Middle Ages. It was solved as you know by Ghazālī, but the solution was a Pyrrhic victory from the orthodox point of view, since it made room in Islam for frenzied poets worshipping no god but the Eternal Beauty, mystical monists like Ibn al-'Arabī and swarms of dervishes who in every sense are Brethren of the Free Spirit.

Although the fact that Islam has never shown itself so intolerant as Christianity towards pantheistic errors is partly, no doubt owing to the absence of any organized ecclesiastical authority, I believe a better reason may be found for it. To Christians of course the claim of any man to be a Christ must appear shocking—but in Western and Central Asia—where the Sasanian kings were regarded by their subjects as gods and where the doctrines of incarnation, anthropomorphism and metempsychosis are indigenous—the idea of the God-man was so far from unfamiliar and unnatural that any one who came forward as such was justified in his claim by the public conscience, however he might be condemned for "betraying the secret of his Lord". It is true that Hallāj, who uttered the

famous words *Ana'l-haq*, "I am the Real," died on the scaffold, but here, as in many other cases, the execution was dictated by political motives. His followers believed that he was taken up alive to heaven and that the actual victim was not he, but a horse or a mule or one of his enemies whom God had transformed into his likeness; which legends, as M. Massignon has lately pointed out,<sup>1</sup> rest on the conviction that a God-man could not possibly suffer the indignity of being crucified and cremated. Among the Moslem saints we meet with several extreme pantheists who would certainly have shared the fate of Hallaj if they had owned allegiance to the mediæval Catholic Church. Thus Báyazid of Bistám is reported to have said using the terms of glorification which Moslems ordinarily apply to God alone, "Glory to me!" "How great is my majesty!" and again, "I went from God to God until He cried from me in me, 'O thou I!'"<sup>2</sup> Such utterances do not deeply offend Muhammadan sentiment, and, if spoken in ecstacy, are readily condoned. Jalálu'ddin Rumi in a magnificent ode describes how the One Light shines in myriad forms through the whole universe, and how the One Essence, remaining ever the same, clothes itself from age to age in a series of incarnations. Let me conclude by quoting a few lines:—

"Every moment the robber Beauty rises in a different shape,  
ravishes the soul, and disappears.

Every instant that Loved One assumes a new garment, now  
of old, now of youth.

Now He plunged into the heart of the substance of the  
potter's clay—the Spirit plunged, like a diver.

Anon He rose from the depths of mud that is moulded and  
baked, then He appeared in the world.

He became Noah, and at His prayer the world was flooded  
while He went into the Ark.

<sup>1</sup> See his article "al-Hallaj" in *Revue de l'histoire des religions* for June, 1911.

<sup>2</sup> *Tadhkirat al-Awliyá*, i, 100, 12.

Paris, 1912.

He became Abraham and appeared in the form of the Ark,  
 which turned to roses for His sake.  
 For a while He was roaming on the earth to pleasure  
 Himself,  
 Then He became Jesus and ascended to the dome of heaven  
 and began to glorify God.  
 In brief, it was He that was coming and going in every  
 generation thou hast seen,  
 Until at last He appeared in the form of an Arab and  
 gained the empire of the world.  
 What is it that is changed ?<sup>1</sup> What is transmigration in  
 reality ? The lovely winner of hearts  
 Became a sword and appeared in the hand of 'Alī and  
 became the Slayer of the time.  
 No ! no ! for 'twas even He that was crying in human  
 shape, 'I am the Real.'  
 That one who mounted the scaffold was not Man-ur,<sup>2</sup>  
 though the foolish imagined it.  
 Rūmī hath not spoken and will not speak words of infidelity  
 do not disbelieve him !  
 Whosoever shows disbelief is an infidel and one of those  
 who have been doomed to hell.

'حرّ حنّه بشکلی نب عتار بر آمد  
 دل برد و بنای شد  
 هر چه بساس دگر آن دایر بر آمد  
 که بر و حوال شد  
 گاهی بدل عیست صفتش فرو رفت  
 شمعش معانی

<sup>1</sup> Meaning, apparently, that here is no question of an individual soul passing from one body to another

<sup>2</sup> Hallāj is often called Mansur, which is properly the name of his father.

<sup>3</sup> *Divan-i Shams-i Tabriz* (ed. of Tabriz, 1280 A.H.), 194, and more fully in the complete Lucknow edition (1302 A.H.), 225. The poem is entitled المستزاد في ظهور الولاية المطلقة العلوية. I give the text of the lines translated above.

کسی از گیت به کل هزار بر آمد

ز آن پس بجهان شد

که نوح شد و گرد جهانرا بدعا فرو

بخود رفت بگشتی

که گشت خلیل و بدل نار بر آمد

آتش گل از آن شد

میگشت دمی چند برین روی زمین او

از بهر نفرت

عسی شد و برگند دوار بر آمد

سبیح کمان شد

بالجمله هم او بود که میآید و میرفت

هر قرن که ددی

با عافیت آن شکل عرب وار بر آمد

دارای جهان شد

منسوخ چه باشد چه باسخ بحسب

آن دلبر ریا

شمس شد و در کف گزار بر آمد

قتال زمان شد

بی بی که هم او بود که مستی انا ای

در صورت تو ای

منصور نبود آنکه بر آن دار بر آمد

دادان نگمان شد

رومی سخن کفر ننگه است و دمید

منکر مشویدش

کافر بود آنکس که بانکار بر آمد

از دوزخیان شد

<sup>1</sup> The Lucknow edition reads "جهان شد", "he flew to Paradise."

<sup>2</sup> The Tabriz edition reads "منسوخ چه باشد نه تناسخ که حقیقت است".

## **THE GOAL OF MUHAMMADAN MYSTICISM**

As the purest water flows from the deepest spring and the loftiest trees are the most firmly rooted, so the highest manifestations of human thought derive their first impulse and their final stability from below. We have seen how the poet gives artistic expression to crude ideas floating in the minds of the common folk, and I venture to say that there is an equally firm popular basis for what has been called the distinctive doctrine of Moslem philosophy—the doctrine of “impersonal immortality.”<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> T. Whittaker, *The Neoplatonists*, 1901

## WESTERN MANICHÆISM AND THE TURFAN DISCOVERIES

By F. LEGGE

**A**BOUT the year 300 it became plain that a new religion was spreading through the eastern provinces of the Roman Empire. This was the faith taught by one Manes or Mânî, a native of Babylonia, who was put to death by order of the Shah Bahraun or Varanes I in 275. One story is that he began to teach when 13 years old, another when he was 24. We know with fair certainty that he was 60 when he died, so that if we take the more probable date his missionary activity must have lasted for thirty-five years—a longer period than has generally been allowed to founders of new religions.<sup>1</sup> His teaching must also have started in the reign of Ardeshir, the restorer of the Zoroastrian religion, by whose orders were collected the books known as the Avesta. Ardeshir's religious restoration was avowedly made for political reasons, and with the view of binding together the newly-founded empire of the Sassanides by a common faith. It seems to have given a good deal of offence to the older Persian nobles, and it was very likely among these that Mânî found his first converts. The later Manichæans boasted that he converted to his doctrines Ardeshir's successor, Shâpûr or Sapor, the conqueror of the Emperor Valerian, and also the next king, Hormuz or Hormisdas, who reigned only a few months. This is evidently an exaggeration, but may cover the fact

<sup>1</sup> The summary of Manes' history here given is mainly taken from Rochat, *Mani sur Mani et sa Doctrine*, Genève, 1867, where the account given by the Christian Fathers is harmonized with that of the Mahommedan writers quoted by Flügel, *Mani, seine Lehre und seine Schriften*, Leipzig, 1862, and Kessler, *Mani*, Berlin, 1866. Cf. Baur, *Die Manichäische Religionslehre*, Tübingen, 1831.



that he obtained a hearing from one or perhaps both of these kings. The result of this was that he was banished from Persia, and spent the rest of his life in visiting India, China, and Turkestan, in all which countries he made many converts. On the accession of Bahram, the third king from Ardeshir, he returned to Persia, and failing, it is said, to support the ordeal of molten lead to which he was subjected, was put to death, probably by beheading.<sup>1</sup>

Mānī's death was followed by a fierce persecution of his followers, which was repeated sooner or later in nearly every country where they were found. It is said that after Mānī's execution his skin was stuffed with straw and hung over the gate of the town where he suffered, as a warning to future heretics. His followers were routed out and slain in great numbers by the Magi to whom Ardeshir's reformation had given great power, and this doubtless led to those who were left alive withdrawing to the outskirts of Persia. Within the next twenty-five years we hear of them in Edessa, in Asia Minor, and in Egypt. Thence they spread along both shores of the Mediterranean and were particularly numerous, perhaps in Northern or Roman Africa. Everywhere their coming produced the same violent measures against them. Diocletian had certainly no objection to Persian religions as such for in 307 he and his colleagues proclaimed Mithras the Persian Sun-god, the protector of their empire.<sup>2</sup> Yet a few years before this, he put forth an edict directing that all Manichean teachers should be burned and their followers beheaded, while the property of Manichæans of every rank was to be confiscated to the State.<sup>3</sup> In the next reign,

<sup>1</sup> See note on previous page.

<sup>2</sup> Cumont, *Textes et Monuments relatifs aux Mystères de Mithra*, Bruxelles, 1906, etc., t. II, p. 146. Cf. *PSBA.*, May, 1912, pp. 196 seq.

<sup>3</sup> de Steop, *La Diffusion du Manichéisme dans l'Empire romain*, Rouleux, 1906, p. 84. The date of the edict is there shown to be 303.

Constantine is said to have at first considered the feasibility of making Manichæism the State religion, and to have commissioned his friend Strategius to inquire into it.<sup>1</sup> What he heard, however, so set him against it that he revived Diocletian's edict, and his example was followed by all the Christian emperors, who published laws of great severity against the Manichæans.<sup>2</sup> Only under the philosophic emperor Julian, who enforced religious toleration to the great disgust of nearly all his subjects did they get a moment's respite. After Julian's death in the Persian war the persecution began again. Popes and emperors alike fulminated against the Manichæans, and when Priscillian, Bishop of Avila, the first heretic to be judicially put to death by Christians, went to the scaffold in 385, Manichæism was the crime of which he was rightly or wrongly accused.<sup>3</sup> It was in the same reign (i.e. that of Theodosius) that the office of Inquisitors of the Faith was instituted, which played so important a part in the later history of Western Manichæism.<sup>4</sup>

In spite of this, Manichæism seems to have made progress, especially in Africa. St. Augustine, the future Bishop of Hippo, was a Manichæan for nine years before his conversion, and we owe most of our knowledge of Western Manichæism to his writings. He seems to have had no difficulty in finding Manichæans to dispute with after his conversion, and these disputes have given us much valuable insight into the doctrines of Mânî when they appeared in the West. The conquest of Africa by the Vandals probably did more than the Roman laws to put an end to the Manichæan propaganda on that continent. Yet it is curious that Manichæans, sometimes in high office, were after this date constantly discovered at

<sup>1</sup> Ammianus Marcellinus, bk. xv, c. 12.

<sup>2</sup> de Steop, *op. cit.*, ch. III.

<sup>3</sup> E. C. Babut, *Priscillien*, Paris, 1909, App. iv.

<sup>4</sup> Gibbon, *Decline and Fall* (Barry's ed.), vol. III, p. 152.

the Court of Constantinople,<sup>1</sup> while those of lesser rank were as frequently sought out and exiled in batches from the Western Empire. The vigilance of the Inquisitors, however, made it incumbent on them to keep their missionary efforts secret, while in the Far East any persecution of them can only have been sporadic. In places like Turkestan and China they were probably left unmolested, and it was here doubtless that they had their chance of organizing themselves into a regular church. This implied as we shall see later, the sending out of missionaries to spread the faith in the neighbouring countries, and the invasion of the Mahomedans in the seventh century dropped, as it were, a veil between what was till then the Persian Empire and Europe. Hence when the Macedonian Emperors of Byzantium began to wrest Western Asia from the feeble hands of Harun al-Rashid's successors they found the non Moslems of Mesopotamia Armenia and Asia Minor entirely given over to a heresy called the Paulician from its supposed connexion with the Apostle Paul. Whether these Paulicians really were as the emperors said Manichæans pure and simple or whether they only sheltered the Manichæans among them, seems impossible to say, nor does it greatly matter for the present purpose. It is at any rate certain that in the middle of the eighth century the Emperor Constantine Copronymos, who is said to have been in sympathy with them, made an expedition into Armenia and transported a great number of them from Western Asia to Constantinople and Thrace.<sup>2</sup> Here in the country which is now the seat of war, they prospered exceedingly, and succeeded in converting many of the Bulgarian tribes to their doctrines. In the tenth century the Emperor John Zimisles followed this up by transplanting a still larger colony to the same place, to whom he handed

<sup>1</sup> The case of Barrymof mentioned later (v. note on p. 86) is typical.

<sup>2</sup> Gibbon, op. cit., vol. vi, p. 121.

over the city of Philippopolis and promised toleration.<sup>1</sup> While still keeping up correspondence with the Paulicians of Armenia, the new colonists sent out missionaries along the northern shore of the Mediterranean, who met with much success in the South of France and in Italy. There followed upon this what Macaulay described in a well-known passage as "the first great rising-up of the human intellect against the spiritual domination of Rome". All Southern Europe is said to have been parcelled out into Manichaean dioceses whose bishops paid allegiance to a Manichaean Pope seated in Bulgaria. Six Manichaeans were burned alive in Orleans, two in our own city of York. The institution of the Mendicant Orders, the revival of the Inquisition and the Albigensian crusade of de Montfort were necessary before Manichaeism in Europe was again driven under the surface, where it lurked perhaps down to the outbreak of the German Reformation.<sup>2</sup>

This dismal history of nine centuries' persecution makes one ask what there was about the Manichaean doctrines that was so shocking to the rulers of the European world. The Manichaeans were what are called dualists, that is to say they taught that the universe sprang from two opposing principles. It consisted, according to them, of Light, which extended without end upward and on each side. Below this was Darkness, which extended without

(Gibbon, op. cit., vol. vi, p. 121; see also App. vi, The Paulician Heresy.

<sup>1</sup> Carl Schmidt, *History of Doctrine of the Sects of the Cathars or Albigensians*, Paris, 1940, passim. Conybeare, *The Key of Truth*, Oxford, 1898, pp. cxxx h, is excellent for the history of the Paulicians and of their relations with other sects. Mr. Conybeare tries hard to prove that the Paulicians were not Manichaeans. It is possible that there were many sects among them, but he quotes (p. cxi) the statement of Eckhart, Bishop of Cologne in 1160, that the Cathars of his time used to celebrate the festival of the Bema or anniversary of the death of Manes. H. C. Lea, *History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages*, London, 1888, vol. ii, says (pp. 91-2) that the Cathars of Languedoc believed in transmigration, and wore the sacred thread of Zoroaster. In the "Ritual of the Albigensians", given in App. vi to Mr. Conybeare's book, is a confession of sins much resembling the *Khandamakist*.

end downward and on each side. Therefore, there was one long frontier where the two confronted each other, and this was the seat of conflict. For countless ages, they said, the Powers of Darkness were contented with fighting among themselves, an idea which is plainly Babylonian. But one day they looked upon the Light, hated it, and resolved to overcome it. Their hatred took shape in the creation of a monstrous being called Satan, who had the head of a lion, the body of a serpent, the wings of a bird, the tail of a fish, and the feet of a reptile. This, as I have suggested elsewhere, may be a reminiscence of the lion-headed figure concealed in the chapels of Mithras,<sup>1</sup> and probably means nothing more than that the King of Darkness was made out of the five *στοιχεῖα* or elements of which matter was then thought to consist. Satan and his hosts invaded the realm of light, and the invasion was reported to the lord of the realm called 'the King of the Paradise of Light'. He, not wishing to send against Satan any of his five worlds of light, fashioned for the purpose a new being called the First Man, who was also made out of five elements these being in his case the ether, air, light water, and fire. With these sometimes spoken of as his armour and sometimes as his sons he marched against Satan, who on his side clothed himself with smoke, flame, darkness hot wind and cloud. In the fight which followed, the First Man was defeated and the armour of the two combatants having become mixed together, the elements of light were contaminated by the elements of darkness. Then the King of the Paradise of Light extricated his creature the First Man, and established him above the place of combat, while he fashioned the present earth out of the mixture of light and darkness, to endure until the elements of the light were redeemed from it.

This redemption of the light-elements was a very

<sup>1</sup> Proceedings of Society of Biblical Archaeology, 1912, p. 141

complicated process, which like the rest of the story seems to be founded on the astronomical ideas of some primitive people. The souls of men, animals, and plants are light and their bodies darkness or matter. A great wheel equipped with twelve buckets or vases like an Egyptian *sukkiyeh* or water-wheel is said to be constantly turning between earth and sky carrying up with it the souls or portions of light as they are won from the mixture. They discharge their contents into the sun and moon, which are described as ships or rather ferry-boats, sailing backwards and forwards upon the ocean of ether or the upper air. These empty their burden into the column of glory always mounting from this world to the realm of light, bearing with it the praises, the hymns of gratitude, and the good deeds of men. When all the light is thus won, the angel who now bears the earth on his shoulders will fly back to the realm of light and a fire will break out which will consume the world. Thus the separation between the light and the darkness will once more be complete.<sup>1</sup>

Now these fantastic notions--nearly all of which, I think, could be traced back to the ideas current in Babylonia many millennia before Christ--must have been very shocking to those who in the reign of Diocletian had shown themselves ready to die for the Christian faith. They transferred the responsibility for the evil which is in the world from the shoulders of man to the God of Light. If the First Man was defeated in his struggle with Satan, the blame must rest, not on his disobedience, as is the case with Adam in the Book of Genesis, but on the deity who sent him into battle imperfectly equipped--in the same way that if a country were to be defeated in war at the present time its citizens would blame, we may hope, not their soldiers, but the War Minister who persuaded them to trust to an army too small for its purpose. But Mani would no doubt have replied to any accusation of

<sup>1</sup> See Reuchet, *op. cit.*, for authorities for these statements.

blasphemy that he did not claim to be a Christian in the ordinary sense of the term. What he aimed at was the establishment, not of Christianity as professed by the Catholics, but of a faith which should blend Christianity with two older religions. He puts it quite plainly in a book called *Shapurakhan*, said to have been composed by him for the benefit of that king Sapor who exiled him. In this book, which is quoted by the Mahomedan Al-Birûni of Khiva, who wrote at the beginning of the eleventh century, he says: "Wisdom and deeds have always from time to time been brought to mankind by the messengers of God. So in one age they have been brought by the messenger called Buddha to India, in another by Zoroaster to Persia, in another by Jesus to the West. Thereupon this revelation has come down, this prophecy in this last age through me, Mânî, the messenger of the God of Truth, to Babylonia."<sup>1</sup> We see, then, that his aim was not so much to found a new faith as to reconcile the three great religions, i.e. those of Zoroaster, Buddha, and Christ, which then shared the civilized world between them. Hence his object was quite as much political as religious, and this explains why he so constantly strove—as it turned out to his own undoing—to get his doctrine adopted by kings and emperors. The rulers of the two great world-empires of the time—the two eyes of the human race—as a Persian ambassador to Diocletian's Court called them—"Arb shir and Shâpuh on the one side, and Diocletian and Constantine on the other, had all shown themselves quite alive to the importance of the political side of religion in the struggle between them that lasted down to the Mahomedan conquest. Thus Mânî's effort was at least well-timed.

How he and his successors hoped to achieve their purpose has hitherto been very doubtful because of the

<sup>1</sup> Al-Birûni, *Chronology of Ancient Nations* (Barthau's ed.), London, 1879, p. 190.

<sup>2</sup> Cumont, *Les Religions Orientales dans le Paganisme romain*, Paris, 1906, p. 164.

almost complete disappearance of their writings. Manichæism, in the West at any rate, was an extremely literary faith; and the Manichæan missionaries seem to have trusted quite as much to their pens as to their tongues to convince people. They gave themselves a free hand by rejecting entirely the Old Testament, which they declared to be the work of the Devil, and everything in the New which referred to the birth of Christ, His observance of the Jewish law, His baptism, temptation, or passion. This left hardly anything of the Christian Scriptures but parts of the Epistles, especially those of St. Paul; but they made up for this by concocting a whole series of gospels, acts, and apocalypses, which they attributed by a literary device, which in those days brought no disgrace with it, to one or other of the Apostles.<sup>1</sup> St. Augustine, once a Manichæan himself, speaks feelingly of the swarms of beautiful Manichæan books, "so numerous, so large, so costly," as he says, which the sect possessed. Unfortunately, he winds up this description, which would make any antiquarian's mouth water, by the advice to burn them all;<sup>2</sup> and the Inquisitors carried out his suggestion only too thoroughly. Such copies of the pseudepigraphical books of the Manichæans as have survived have been in the phrase of the time "made orthodox", that is to say, have been altered so as to take out of them everything distinctly Manichæan. All their other writings in Greek or Latin were destroyed; and so carefully was this done that our only knowledge of Manichæan opinions until lately was derived from the controversial books of the Catholic writers in Roman times who set about to refute them, and the proceedings of the Dominican Inquisitors, who laboured in the Middle Ages to exterminate them.

<sup>1</sup> de Stoop, *op. cit.*, pp. 127 sqq. Dufourcq, *de Manichæismo apud Latinos*, Paris, 1800, pp. 32 sqq.

<sup>2</sup> *Contra Faustum*, bk. xiii, c. 14.



In the last century some new sources, however, were tapped. Sir Henry Rawlinson, in 1868, drew attention to the *Vestiges* of the chronologist Al-Birûnî, which, as has been said, contained a small fragment of the words of Mânî himself. The learned Flügel, a few years earlier, also published the Arabic text and translation of the work of en-Nadîm generally called the *Fihrist*, which contained copious extracts from the writings either of Mânî or of some of his successors; and this was followed up by the late Professor Kessler, who published in 1889 the first part of a work unfortunately left unfinished at his death, collating en-Nadîm's statements with those found in many other Christian and Mahommedan writers in Arabic and Syriac, as also with the Greek formulas of abjuration employed by the Catholic Church when "receiving" a convert from Manichæism.<sup>1</sup> Lastly, in 1898, M. Pognon, the French Consul at Aleppo, worthily keeping up the learned tradition of Botta and de Sarzec, published the Syriac text and translation of part of the Nestorian bishop Theodore bar Khûnî's *Book of Scholia* written at Kashgar not later than the eighth century, and containing much information about the Manichæan doctrines.<sup>2</sup> These documents, although very valuable, were, of course, open to the same objection as our earlier sources, that is to say, they represented, not what the Manichæans said, but what their adversaries said they said. Our experience of the ethics of religious controversy led one to fancy that these might be two very different things.

All these doubts have been put an end to by the discoveries of the last few years. As appears from Professor von Le Coq's account of them in the Society's *Journal*,<sup>3</sup> in 1902 and again in 1904 expeditions were sent, mainly by the generosity of the German Emperor, to the oasis of

<sup>1</sup> *Forschungen über die Manichäische Religion*, Berlin, 1889.

<sup>2</sup> *Inscriptions Manichéennes des Coupes de Khawabir*, Paris, 1898.

<sup>3</sup> *JRAS.*, 1902, pp. 299 sqq.

Turfan in Chinese Turkestan. The first of these resulted in the discovery of a great heap of MSS., which Dr. Franz Müller, of Berlin, recognized as written in a variety of the Estrangelo script used exclusively by the Manichæans. The publication of these texts with Dr. Müller's translation left no doubt possible that we here had texts written at some time before the tenth century for the use of a large Manichæan community; and the second German expedition discovered in addition a quantity of Manichæan wall-paintings, including one which may be a picture of Māni himself, miniatures, painted flags like those used by Buddhists but bearing Manichæan inscriptions, and more Manichæan MSS. The Russian archaeologists, who were the first to discover the treasures of Turfan, also obtained MSS. of the same kind; and in 1907 Dr. (now Sir) Marc Aurel Stein succeeded in obtaining in the oasis of Tun-huang in the Chinese province of Kan-su access to another hoard of similar MSS. in the caves known as the Grotto of the Thousand Buddhas. A French expedition in 1908, under Count d'Ollone, also gave good results, and led to the remainder of the MSS. at Tun-huang being removed to the National Library at Peking for safe custody. All the Manichæan documents hitherto discovered are either in the Uigur dialect of Tatar or Turkish, in another dialect called after one of Alexander's provinces Sogdian, in Pahlavi, or in Chinese. Nearly all are in the Manichæan script, the key to which we owe, I think, to Dr. Franz Müller.

Now it is not given to everyone to wrestle with these strange tongues, even if most of these documents were not written in what is in effect cryptography; and for the moment we are more concerned with their translations than with the originals. These are coming out rather slowly; but more than 1,000 of the Turfan fragments have been translated into German by Professor Müller, and are appearing in the *Abhandlungen* of the Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences. These *Transactions* are

## WESTERN MANICHÆISM AND TURFAN DISCOVERIES

of course in the British Museum, but it is very difficult to get hold of a copy elsewhere. A summary of the contents of those fragments which had appeared up to the date of publication is to be found in the last edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* from the pen, I think, of Mr. Conybeare, and will be of great help to anyone who wishes to study them. They consist mostly of Manichæan prayers and hymns, but owing to the way in which the paper rolls on which they are written have been rolled up, the titles of all of them are missing. It is notoriously unsafe to deduce creeds or doctrines from devotional exercises, and it might be hard to make much of these fragments taken alone. Luckily, however, at both Turfan and Tun-huang several copies were found of a document called *Khuastuungft*, which turned out to be the Litany or Confession of Sins which the lowest order of Manichæan believers were accustomed to recite ritually at certain seasons with a prayer that the sins there set out might be "remitted." The veteran Russian scholar, Professor Radloff, published in 1909 a translation of this from a copy in Uigur characters now in St. Petersburg<sup>1</sup>. Last year Professor von Le Coq, the leader of the last Prussian expedition to Turkestan, who saw reason to disagree with some of Professor Radloff's version, published in the Society's *Journal* a fresh translation made from the copy obtained by Sir Marc Aurel Stein at Tun huang, also in the Tatar language and the Uigur dialect, but unlike Professor Radloff's, written in Manichæan script<sup>2</sup>. With this he has collated the fragments of the same Litany now in Berlin and the fact that we have here three different sources to draw from gives us a confidence in our own text which we could not have if it depended on one MS. only. It is also a most important document for the study of Manichæism;

<sup>1</sup> *Khvastuungft, das Bekenntnis der Manichæer*, St. Petersburg, 1909.

<sup>2</sup> JRS., April, 1911.

because, while it contains a sort of recapitulation of the Manichæan ideas on the origin of the world summarized above, it also, in its recitals of the different sins repented of, shows what were the Manichæan ethics or morals, and gives us much insight into the organization and the ritual practices—fasts, services, and so on—of the Manichæan Church. But this is not all. One of the documents from Tun huang sent to Peking in the belief that it was a Buddhist text, turns out to be a long doctrinal treatise or sermon written in the Chinese character and language for the edification probably, of Chinese converts to Manichæism. It purports to be a conversation in the form of a Buddhist *sutra* between Māni himself and his disciple Addas who is described by the Christian Fathers as his Apostle to the East. It was first translated into modern Chinese—its date must be earlier than the year 1035, when the cave in which it was found by Sir Marc Stein was bricked up<sup>1</sup>—by the learned Chinese Mr. Lo-Tchen-yu, and is now being published in the *Journal Asiatique* by MM. Edouard Chavannes and Paul Pelliot, the last of whom was a member of Count d'Ollone's expedition.<sup>2</sup> With these three categories of documents we have at last a mass of first hand material for the study of Manichæism.

It would take a very long time to describe in detail all that these documents teach us. But it should be said that they confirm in nearly every point all that the Christian and Mahommedan writers have said about Manichæism. We are so accustomed to discount what religious opponents say of each other's doctrines and practices, that no one would have been surprised if it had turned out that those of the Manichæans were quite different from what their contemporaries said they were.

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Dunnistoun Ross said at the meeting that further investigation had made this date 300 years later.

<sup>2</sup> "Un Traité Manichéen retrouvé en Chine": *Journal Asiatique* for November-December, 1911. This is the first part only. It is hoped that the conclusion of the article will shortly follow.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 1912.

But it is not so. With very trifling exceptions, all that the Christian Fathers, beginning with St. Augustine, the Mahommedan writers who were brought into contact with them in the East soon after the Arab invasion of the seventh century, and the Inquisitors of Provence and Languedoc, who in the Middle Ages practically drove them out of Europe—all that these writers said about them turns out to be literally true: and it is clear that although these opponents of Manichæism extenuated nothing, yet that they set down nought in malice.<sup>1</sup> When one thinks of the way in which Catholic and Protestant controversialists still misrepresent each other's doctrines, one is inclined to wonder why the religious disputants of the first Christian millennium should have been so much fairer to their adversaries than those of the second."

Another point that comes out very clearly is that the rulers of those times—Persian Shahs, Roman Emperors, and Catholic Popes—knew very well what they were about when they persecuted Manichæism to the death. Manichæism was not only a religion, but it was what most Europeans think exists only in fiction—a perfectly efficient and capable secret society. Whether this society was forced upon the Manichæans by persecution, or whether, as seems more probable, it was from the first the ideal set up by Mani, it is now impossible to say, but the whole organization of the Manichæan Church seems

It has been pointed out to me that a passage in the *Fihrist* (Flügel, op. cit., p. 100) makes Manes say that Jesus was a deceiver. It is, I think, plain that he is here recording the opinion, not of Manes, but of some late sect of his followers, and this may be due to the fact that Manes belonged, in his youth, to the Mughtaslah, who said that Jesus was a deceiver, who had obtained baptism from St. John Baptist by a trick. It is directly contradicted by an earlier statement in the *Fihrist* that Manes announced himself to be the Paraclete, whose coming had been predicted by Jesus as good news (Flügel, op. cit., p. 93).

<sup>1</sup> The existence and popularity of the Manichæan books at the time may of course account for much.

designed with an eye to its preservation. The adherents of Manichæism were divided into five orders—five being, as we have already seen, a sort of sacred number among them. The three higher ones are difficult to describe with certainty, because there is as yet no very clear evidence to be drawn from our documents concerning them. En-Nadim, whose information is generally to be trusted, says outright that there were five “degrees” in Manichæism, which were in their order

1. The Masters or Sons of Gentleness
2. The Sun-enlightened or Sons of Knowledge.
3. The Priests or Sons of Intelligence
4. The True or Sons of Discretion (i.e. Secrecy).
5. The Hearers or Sons of Inquiry or Discernment.

These alternative titles (Sons of Gentleness, etc.) correspond in name to the Five Worlds of Light over which the King of the Paradise of Light rules and which, it will be remembered, he did not wish to send against Satan. On the other hand, St. Augustine says that there were in the Manichæan Church twelve “masters”, in imitation of the twelve Apostles, with a thirteenth ruling over them and representing Māni himself. Then came seventy-two bishops and below them again an apparently unlimited number of priests and deacons.<sup>1</sup> The Chinese document confirms this in so far as it speaks of a “chief of the religion” or Pope and also of certain “masters”, who are also mentioned in the Turfan texts.<sup>2</sup> But there is nothing to show whether these “masters” correspond to the highest degree of En-Nadim, or whether they with the Pope and the bishops were not a separate hierarchy chosen out of the fourth order or degree of Manichæans.<sup>3</sup> It

<sup>1</sup> The correspondence between the “degrees” of Manichæism and the worlds of light appears in the *Fihrist* (Flügel, *op. cit.*, p. 95). For St. Augustine’s division of the sect see his *de Hereticis*, c. 46.

<sup>2</sup> *Journal Asiatique*, *ubi cit.*, p. 581, and n.

<sup>3</sup> See de Steop, *op. cit.*, p. 35, and n. 2.

would seem on the whole that the three higher degrees of Manichæism were in any case purely administrative, and that those who took them remained unknown to the lower ranks.

With regard to the fourth order of the society there can be no doubt. These are they whom St. Augustine calls *Electi* or the Elect, En-Nadlin the Sons of the Secret, other Mahommedan writers the Siddiks or Saints, and the mediæval Inquisitors the Perfect. These last are particularly good evidence on this point, because more than one of the Perfects in Languedoc turned, so to speak, king's evidence, were converted to Catholicism, rose to the rank of Inquisitor, and helped in that capacity to settle the *Practica*, which down to the abolition of the Holy Office in Spain remained, and for aught we know still remains, the authoritative code of Inquisitorial Law.<sup>1</sup> All writers agree that it was these Perfects who were the missionaries of the sect, and that they were compelled by an ordinance going back to Mânî himself never to rest in one place, but to wander perpetually through all lands there to spread the faith.<sup>2</sup> They comprised both men and women, but might never marry nor be given in marriage, and the Inquisitors say that, while they were never either to touch or be touched by one of the opposite sex, they were never to be alone by night or by day. They were to take only one meal a day, and this might never include meat, eggs, or strong drink, although fish was not forbidden to them. They were always to be gentle and humble in their demeanour, and might wear only one garment a year, which must be black in colour, while they might do no work and possess no money nor other property, being supported entirely by the alms of the fifth

<sup>1</sup> e.g. Rainerio Saccone. See Lea's *History of the Inquisition*, vol. II, p. 96; so Peter Martyr was the son of a Cathar, and Robert le Begre, a thirteenth Inquisitor, had been a Cathar for twenty years. See Schmidt, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 138.

<sup>2</sup> *Journal Asiatique*, *ubi cit.*, p. 372, n. 3.

order.<sup>1</sup> Finally, they were never to take the life of even a vegetable, and were not to annoy or distress the smallest animal. The austerities they practised had such an effect on them that the Inquisitors declared they could always recognize a Perfect by the paleness of his or her face. This was also noticed by the Fathers, one of whom seems to have disbelieved without reason in the sincerity of the Perfect, since he spitefully hints that pallor can be produced by other means than fasting.<sup>2</sup>

We come to the lowest and largest order of Manichæans, called the Auditors or Hearers, of whom fewer sacrifices were required. En-Nadim puts it quite plainly when he quotes from some unnamed Manichæan book, that anyone who is filled with love for the faith but does not feel strong enough to conquer all desire and greed, can become a Hearer if he be willing to protect the Manichæan religion and the Perfect. The new documents, particularly the *Khuastuaništ* make it quite clear that the Hearer had also to keep the ten commandments of Māni, which are: not to pray to idols, not to lie, to abstain from avarice, murder, adultery, and theft, from false doctrine and magic, from doubt, and from idleness.<sup>3</sup> He also had to make daily certain prayers and fasts, some lasting for two days and one for at least a month, and if say the Inquisitors, he commits any sins, he is to confess them before the whole congregation.<sup>4</sup> This seems to suggest the white sheet and penitential bench and it was so understood until the publication of the *Khuastuaništ* showed us that it really meant the recital of the Litany of that name. But the main difference between the Perfect and the Hearer was

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Journal Asiatique*, *ibid.*, p. 576, n. 2, and p. 577, n. 4, and Schmidt, *op. cit.*, p. 94. The *socius* or companion was not bound to be a Perfect.

<sup>2</sup> Cyril of Jerusalem. (Cf. de Steoop, *op. cit.*, p. 20, n. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Kessler, *op. cit.*, p. 306.

<sup>4</sup> Schmidt, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 99; Mantland, *Facts and Documents relating to the Manichæans*, London, 1832, p. 141.



in their supposed lot after death. While the soul of the Perfect is conducted by a god of light and a beautiful virgin to the Column of Praises, which bears him to the Heaven of the First Man, that of the Hearer remains on earth, passing by five successive transmigrations into the bodies of ~~man~~, or other animals, and in the intervals of these ~~transmigrations~~ rests in a state like that of a sleeping man who is haunted by frightful dreams. When these transmigrations are complete he becomes a Perfect; but if in the meantime the end of the world should come, we gather that he will be cast into the Darkness to live for ever with Satan and his hosts.<sup>1</sup>

One curious charge against the Manichæans is disproved by the new documents. The Inquisitors insisted that the Hearers among them might outwardly profess any religion they pleased, so long as they held fast the Manichæan faith in secret. This appears incredible when we remember that, as Macaulay tells us, the hatred of the Manichæans for Catholicism was so openly marked that "Viler than a priest!" and "I would as soon be a priest as do so-and-so" in their time of power became everyday expressions in Southern Europe. But the Turkestan MSS. show that the Manichæans had a much more subtle scheme of propaganda than mere concealment of their doctrines. The First Man or Archetype whom they figured as enthroned in the heaven immediately above us waiting mournfully but patiently for the time when all the light should be restored to his kingdom, seems to have changed his name according to the beliefs of the people among whom the Manichæans were working for converts.

<sup>1</sup> Kessler, pp. 308-9. It is even possible that he was supposed to rise higher in the scale of being. Barzmes, the moon-land of protected by Theodora (Procopius, *Anecdota*, cap. xvii; de Socrus, *op. cit.*, p. 34), cannot during most of his life have been anything but a Hearer. But in one of the Turfan fragments he is invoked as "the Lord Barzmes", an epithet reserved for the "Messengers" of the Light like Buddha, Jesus, and Mait.

<sup>2</sup> St. Augustine, *contra Faust.*, bk. xii, c. 17.

In the Africa of St. Augustine's time they called him Jesus -that Jesus *passibilis* or suffering Jesus who they said, had no cause to be crucified, because His members were even now hanging from every tree, being dispersed through the plants and animals of the whole world, and suffering until they should once again be united with Him. But in the Tatar *Khuastuanist*, which no doubt goes back to a Pahlavi original, he is called Ormuzd, the god of light, who in the Avesta fights against Ahriman, whom he will one day conquer.<sup>1</sup> So, too, in the Chinese treatise, the King of the Paradise of Light appears as "the Great Holy One" or "the Venerable", perhaps the oldest of the lights; but in the Turfan texts as Zervan or Time,<sup>2</sup> that being who in the Shah Yazdegerd's version of Mazdeism was said to have preceded and given birth to both Ormuzd and Ahriman. There was even among the African Manichæans an attempt, according to the Fathers, to show that they too had a Trinity corresponding to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit of the Catholic Church,<sup>3</sup> and in the Chinese text we find Mâni spoken of as the Tathâgata, an expression generally confined to Sakyamuni or Gotama Buddha.<sup>4</sup> Thus the Manichæans could tell the Christians that they were the only true Christians, the followers of Zoroaster that they were the only true Zoroastrians, and the Buddhists that they were the only true Buddhists, while at the same time they were trying to undermine all these faiths. In this way they carried out St. Paul's injunction to be all things to all men.

These and other facts too long to describe, show that Manichæism was a real danger to the State as

<sup>1</sup> See *Journal Asiatique*, *ubi cit.*, p. 513, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Müller, *Handschriften Reste aus Turfan*, Berlin, 1904, Fr. 4 Cf. "Khuastuanist": JRAS., 1911, p. 281. The different allusions to this god in Manichæism are brought together by Chavannes & Pelliot in *Journal Asiatique*, *ubi cit.*, pp. 542-3, n. 2.

<sup>3</sup> St. Augustine, *contra Faust.*, bk. xx, nn. 2 and 6. Cf. Müller, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

<sup>4</sup> *Journal Asiatique*, *ubi cit.*, p. 557, n. 2.

well as to the Church. The late Henry Lea, in his very thorough and well-documented *History of the Inquisition*, which is full of information as to the Manichæans of the Middle Ages, says that if it had been allowed to flourish unchecked it would have destroyed the institution of the family and have finally endangered the existence of the human race. He evidently refers to the strict celibacy enjoined on the Perfect; but as this order was confined to a very small number of Manichæans—it is said that there were never more than a few thousand Perfects at any one time in Europe<sup>1</sup>—it must have had far less effect in that way than the Catholic institution of monachism. But Mân's apparent aim was not to extinguish the human race, but to subject it to a priestly tyranny of the worst kind. All the accusations of priestcraft which Protestant controversialists or the writers of romances have made against the Jesuit order seem to be justified against the Manichæan Perfects. A tiny minority, chosen by co-optation and subject to no authority but that of possibly unknown heads, were to have absolute control over the whole community, and were to exercise power all the more dangerous because it was used in secret. The Perfects, too, had a sanction attached to their commands which the Jesuits never claimed. The Inquisitors found that the Hearers not only obeyed them in spiritual matters, but took their advice in all others, and generally paid them what seemed to be exaggerated respect. The new documents show that for this there was very good reason. St Augustine mentions more than once that by merely passing into the bodies of the Elect the food which the

<sup>1</sup> Raniero Macchione, the Perfect turned Inquisitor mentioned above, says (in 1240) that there were only 4,000 Perfects in the whole of Europe. See Schmidt, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 96. As the Slav countries, especially Russia, were full of them, these numbers leave very few for Languedoc. At the great "synod" or gathering of the Manichæans at the Château de Pleumoulin in 1223 there were more than 100 Perfects (*ibid.*, p. 266), and this seems to have been the maximum possible (*ibid.*, p. 267).

Hearers gave them was thought to give up its light or share of the armour of the First Man, which thus returned to the divinity from whom it came.<sup>1</sup> Hence the Perfects not only had within them a greater share of the divine nature than other men, but were actually by merely supporting existence helping forward the work of redemption. This, owing to some ambiguity in St. Augustine's expressions, might seem to refer to the Christian Eucharist. But the simpler and more direct explanation of the tenet is abundantly confirmed both by the Turfan and the Tun-huang texts,<sup>2</sup> and was evidently one of the cardinal doctrines of the religion. That it gave the Perfects a much greater power over their Hearers than the Catholic priests could in the ordinary way exercise over their flocks, can be judged from what happened in the case of the early Christian martyrs who were thought in the theology of the time to go to Heaven directly after their death instead of waiting like other men for the Last Judgment. The fact that they were thus in their lifetime already, as it were half divine gave them such honour among their fellows that they were as the Pagan writers tell us, attended in their prisons by weeping crowds ministering to them, imploring their blessing and kissing their fetters', and the bishops in some cases found themselves obliged to discourage martyrdom lest they should thus lose all authority over their flocks. Evidently, if the civil rulers had not suppressed Manichæism they would soon have ceased to rule, and their States would have sunk into the decay which the rule of the Priest-Kings brought upon Egypt.

Something may be said in conclusion about the light which the new Manichæan texts throw on some other documents of the same or a previous age. There seem to be only two religious documents in a European

<sup>1</sup> *Contra Faust.*, bk. ii, c. 8; *ibid.*, *Confessions*, bk. iii, c. 10.

<sup>2</sup> *Journal Asiatique*, *ubi cit.*, pp. 389-90, nn. 1, 3.

language extant which go back to the early Christian centuries and have certainly escaped the "making orthodox" process. These are the *Pistis Sophia* now in the British Museum and the *Bruce Papyrus* in the Bodleian at Oxford. Both are in Coptic, but I gave reasons in a study of them, published nineteen years ago,<sup>1</sup> for thinking that they were originally written in Greek; and this is admitted by M. Amélineau, of the Sorbonne, and Dr. Karl Schmidt, of the University of Berlin, who have since published translations of them into French and German respectively. Both books are ostensibly written by Christian Gnostics, and I have said that the earliest of them may well be the work of Valentinus, the great Gnostic teacher of Hadrian's time, who flourished about a century and a half before Māni. But the phraseology of this work, which we may call the story of *Pistis Sophia*, bears the most extraordinary likeness to that of the new Manichean texts. Light is everywhere used in it as synonymous with the divine or good, the main narrative tells how the heroine a spirit of light is entrapped and held captive by the demons of darkness in much the same manner as the First Man of Māni, and she effects her deliverance by singing hymns of penitence closely resembling the *Khuastnamah*. The sun and moon are also described in the *Pistis Sophia* as ships employed in the redemption of the light, this world is spoken of as the *Kerasmos* or confusion of light with matter and the burning up of the world and the shutting out of those who have not procured in time their translocation to the Heaven of Light, figure in both documents. But beyond all this, many of the personages in the drama seem to be the same here as those in the Manichean texts. The five worlds of the King of Light here called the Five Parastatæ or Helpers, are described in the *Pistis Sophia*, and Jesus promises His twelve Apostles that when the world is

<sup>1</sup> *Scottish Review*, July, 1883, pp. 133 seq.

consumed they shall reign with him as kings in the last Parastates. A god or power of light called Iēū, who here appears as the Demiurge, Grand Architect, or arranger of the Kerammon, is once called in the *Pistis Sophia* the First Man; other powers of light, called in the same document the Five Trees, whose functions are nowhere explained, reappear and play an important part in the Chinese treatise; and a pair of "Twin Saviours", who are repeatedly mentioned but never described in the *Pistis Sophia* proper, seem to correspond to a similar pair of twins called the Appellant and Respondent in the Turfan and Tun-huang texts. In the *Bruce Papyrus*, which I have shown belongs to the same school as the *Pistis Sophia*, there are also many features which at first sight appear distinctly Manichæan, and the name of one of the powers of light there given as "Afrēdōn the good" seems to correspond to an angel called "Fredōn the good" in one of Dr Muller's Turfan texts; while the Manichæan doctrine of transmigration, or the passage of the lower order of initiates' souls into other bodies, is also given in one of the documents of the *Pistis Sophia*. These resemblances can of course be accounted for in more ways than one. Hun Daisān or Bardesanes was a disciple of Valentinus, and was for a long time all-powerful in the Christian Churches of Mesopotamia and especially of Edessa. Hence Māni would naturally have come in direct contact with his teaching, and through him with that of Valentinus, and may have borrowed from the writings of this last as freely as he did from the Zoroastrian and the Buddhist Scriptures. On the other hand, the *Pistis Sophia* and the *Bruce Papyrus*, the handwriting of which shows that they were transcribed at a fairly late date, may have been composed after the Manichæan texts, and in that case may have borrowed from them. I do not myself consider this likely; but I have shown that the *Pistis Sophia* is not all composed, as was once thought, by the same writer, and includes at least six

documents of different if related origin.<sup>1</sup> It may even be a manual of extracts composed for the benefit of some Inquisitor or heresiologist: and hence it is possible that extracts from a treatise by a fairly late Manichean writer may have slipped in among others of an earlier date. Finally, there is the possibility that neither the system of the *Pistis Sophia* nor that of Māni is original, but are borrowed, phraseology and all from some older belief<sup>2</sup>, and it will take a good deal of careful comparison before one can tell which of these three hypotheses is the most probable. This is only an example of the many questions raised and perhaps solved by the new documents.

Apart from this, the importance of the study of Manichæism now made possible is manifest. Up to the middle of the nineteenth century it formed one of the battle-grounds between Catholic and Protestant, and most Protestant controversialists claimed the Albigensians of Languedoc as their spiritual predecessors on the ground that any body hostile to Rome must be a friend to her enemies. To this the Catholics retorted that they had always been of the same opinion, and that as the Albigensians were Manichæans, it followed that their Protestant successors were so too. Later, when the Oxford Movement revived the study of the Fathers, it was seen that the Manichæan aims and doctrines were not those which any Christian Church would wish to profess, and the claim of any kinship between them and those of the German Reformers was tacitly dropped. Mr. Conybeare, in his *Key of Truth* (p. cl), seeks indeed to show that there is an actual historical connexion between the Unitarians and Baptists of England and America and the <sup>3</sup>Paulicians of Armenia: but this is

<sup>1</sup> *Scottish Review*, *sup. cit.*, pp. 136-7.

<sup>2</sup> Such as the Babylonian. See Boussuet, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, Göttingen, 1907, *passim*.

another matter, and the evidence that he offers in support of his view is not very strong.

Meanwhile, there is plenty of reason why the history of Manichæism should be studied for its own sake. A faith that held its own in the face of the hottest persecution for nine centuries is a rare enough phenomenon and one which cannot be safely neglected by the student of Comparative Religion. Moreover, it gives us some insight into the minds of men with regard to such matters in the third century, a period about which, as has been lately said, we know less than about any other since the time of Alexander. It must have been a terrible time when earthquakes, pestilence, and foreign and internecine war seemed to have been let loose to destroy the civilized world. As it has left behind it no masterpiece of art or literature, it has been assumed that it was a period of decay; but it might be nearer the truth to say that, like other troublous times, it was a period of birth and growth. It was in this century that the Christian Church perfected an organization that has enabled it to resist all the attacks of time and fortune. It was then, too, that the wonderful system of Roman Law was founded on which all the jurisprudence of the civilized world has since been based. And it was then that the reforms of Diocletian put the constitution of the Empire into a shape which, bureaucratic as it may have been, yet enabled it to flourish in spite of internal revolutions and foreign invasions for another thousand years. It was in the midst of such events as these that Manichæism was born.

If, however, all the Manichæan documents lately discovered are to be available, steps ought to be taken at once. While the contents of the Grotto of the Thousand Buddhas have been transferred to Peking with good results to learning in the shape of the Chinese treatise mentioned above, nothing seems to have been done to rescue the MSS. left behind at the Turfan oasis by the



Russian and Royal Prussian expeditions. Professor Harnack and Mr. Conybeare say that the vellum of these MSS. is being used by the natives as window-panes for their huts. The documents thus lost to learning may be among the most valuable remains of antiquity, and proper representations to the Chinese Government might have the effect of securing the safe custody of those which still remain. It is partly in the hope that such representations may be made through its instrumentality, that I have brought these facts to the notice of the Society.

## VI

### THE QUESTION OF KANISHKA

By J. E. FLEET, I.C.S. (Retd.), Ph.D., C.I.E.

[N the last October number of this Journal Mr. Kennedy gave us the concluding parts of his paper entitled "The Secret of Kanishka". We may differ from him on some details. We may hesitate, for instance, to accept the suggestion that the origin of the era of A.C. 58 was the convocation of the Fourth Buddhist Council by the Kushan king Kanishka, rather than the actual beginning of his reign; which involves the view that, while he was king *de facto* for some time before that year, he became recognized as king *de jure*, and his regnal reckoning was fairly started, and was accepted as the official state reckoning, only when, in that year, having become converted to Buddhism, he caused the Council to be held.<sup>1</sup> But there can be no doubt as to the general great value of what he has laid before us.

In particular, he has brought out two things. He has shown that there was a Kushan kingdom in India before A.D. 50.<sup>2</sup> and, as a matter of fact, in the first century B.C. And in connection with the silk-trade which existed in that same century between China and Syria via Khotan, North-West India, Kabul, and the head of the Persian Gulf, he has accounted for all the peculiarities which mark the coins of the Kanishka group. This trade explains

<sup>1</sup> There would be, indeed, nothing impossible in that, and nothing strange about the reckoning being then accepted by also the Brāhmanas and the Jains in spite of its origin: the other sects could not avoid adopting that which would become forthwith the general official reckoning quite as much as a Buddhist reckoning. Still, I prefer to retain the belief that the era had its origin in the regnal years of Kanishka pure and simple, apart from any sectarian question.

<sup>2</sup> This is the closely approximate date of the Kushan prince Kosula-Kadphises, who, according to opponents of A.C. 58 as the initial date of Kanishka, was the founder of the Kushan supremacy.

(1) why Kanishka introduced the gold coinage which was so new a feature in India; (2) why the legends on the coins are only Greek, instead of being bilingual like those on other Indian coins of the same early times; (3) why these Greek legends are in cursive characters, which were, again, quite a new feature on the Indian coins; and (4) why a particular weight was adopted for these coins. And this last point is of special importance, because we find now that the weight of these coins did not follow any standard which was set up at Rome from B.C. 46 onwards, but was adjusted to suit a ratio between gold and silver which prevailed in Western Asia before that time.

There are also two points to which I have drawn attention elsewhere. One is that tradition placed Kanishka 400 years (in round numbers) after the death of Buddha: that is, in B.C. 83 (for 58).<sup>1</sup> The other is that the Latin H with the value *h*, which we find mixed up with the Greek characters in the legends on the coins of Nahapāna (A.D. 78 to 125) and in Northern India in the Kushan territory itself, on the coins of Kharastā, Kharahostēs (about A.D. 25), is strikingly absent from the coins of Huvishka; especially in the transcription of the name of the god Mahasēna (rendered by Maasēno) in which it must inevitably have been used if it was known in India in his time.<sup>2</sup>

There are other points too, some of which remain to be set out in full. But those mentioned above are the clearest and most leading ones. And on the basis of them alone there is now thanks largely to Mr Kennedy, a case which is conclusive, in my opinion, in the direction of placing Kanishka early in the first century B.C., and, in short, of endorsing the view, held at one time by Cunningham and maintained by Professor Franke, the Sinologist, and by me, that he began to reign in B.C. 58 and founded the so-called Vikrama-era beginning in that year.

<sup>1</sup> See this Journal, 1906, 979.   <sup>2</sup> See this Journal, 1907, 1020, 1041, 1042

At almost just the same moment, however, there appeared a paper by Professor Liders which is directed to putting the matter in quite a different light.<sup>1</sup> Anything written by him commands attention, and should receive it promptly if we differ from him on any important point. Accordingly, though not able, just now at least, to give the whole question the full treatment which it may still require, by presenting along with a criticism of his paper a résumé of the entire argument in favour of the theory of *BC. 58*, I will invite attention to some points in his case which are, I consider, fatal in themselves to his combinations.

Professor Liders has taken his stand on the *Ara* inscription made known to us by the treatment of it by Mr R. D. Banerji which was published, with a facsimile in the *Indian Antiquary*, 1908, p. 58. This is a Kharosthi record, from the northern parts of the Kushan dominions.<sup>2</sup> And the first thing to be noted is that it is dated

Maharajasa . . . . . Kanishkasa sambat<sup>3</sup>atāc  
 ēkachapar[iśao] sam 20 20 1 . . . in the forty-first year, the  
 year 41 of the great king . . . . . Kanishka."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Proceedings of the Royal Prussian Academy of Science, 1912, pp. 424-31.

The original stone is in the Lahore Museum. Mr. Banerji, told us that it was discovered "in an ancient well in a *aula* known as *Ara*, two miles from Bagmalah", but did not tell us where to find the place. From inquiries made for me by Dr. Spooner, it would seem that the place is the 'Chah Bagh Nilah' of maps, about ten miles south south west from Attock, and apparently on the south bank of the Indus at a part where the river, having made a sharp bend about eight miles below Attock, runs to the west for some ten miles, the latitude and longitude appear to be 33° 46' and 72° 12'.

<sup>2</sup> Professor Liders' translation runs: '(During the reign) of the Mahārāja . . . . . Kanishka, in the 41st year, the year 41.' This is in accordance with one of the alternative meanings (see below). But it is not a literal translation of the text; and what we want in dealing with such records is the literal translation before we go on to piping any particular meaning on it.

As is well known from our acquaintance with a large number of dated Indian records, this wording places the act which was registered by this inscription, namely, the construction of a well in the time of a king Kanishka who was then living and reigning. And we may take the wording as denoting either (1) a regnal year, in which case this king Kanishka himself had been reigning for 41 years; or (2) a year of an era, in which case he had been preceded by one or more kings during the 41 years.<sup>1</sup>

Professor Liders has adopted the second understanding. And he has referred this record to the 41st year of the reckoning presented in other records which give us kings' names with dates as follows: Kanishka, with years ranging from 3 to 11, Vasishka with the years 24 and 28, Huvishka, with years ranging from 33 to 60, and Vasudeva, with years ranging from 74 to 98.

Immediately before the name of Kanishka there stands a word which gives his father's name by mentioning him as 'son of (so and so)'. This name was read by Mr. Banerji as Vasishpa. Professor Liders reads it as Vajheshka. He identifies this name with that of the king Vasishka whom we have mentioned just above. And he arrives at two separate Kanishkas, the second of whom he suggests to be a son and successor of Vasishka and probably a grandson of the first Kanishka.

I quite agree with Professor Liders that we must recognize two separate kings Kanishka I and Kanishka II. Beyond this I do not see my way to my agreement with him.

The first syllable of the name of the father of Kanishka II may certainly be taken as *va* though it might also be *a*.

<sup>1</sup> But, as Professor Liders has indicated, we may not take it as not mentioning the reigning king but as meaning the 41st year of an era founded by a dead and gone Kanishka.

The next syllable is, as Professor Lüders has said, certainly not *si*. Nor is it *śi* or *shi*. It is a difficult character: and I cannot improve on the proposal to read it as *jhe*.

The third and last syllable is distinctly *shpa*, as read by Mr. Banerji, not *shka*: we have only to compare it with the *shka* of *Kanishkasa* in the same line, to recognize this. Professor Lüders has quoted the Zeda inscription as giving an instance of the name Kanishka being written as if it were Kanishpa. But we must judge each document separately on its own merits: remarking, however, if we are to compare other records, that the *shka* seems to be formed quite indubitably in *Kaneshkasa* in the Mānikīāla inscription, and is certainly so formed in *Kanishkasya* and *Hoveshkasya* in the Sūe Vihār and Wardak inscriptions. And the *shka* in the name of Kanishka II was formed by the writer of the Ara inscription so clearly and unmistakably that we may assume safely that he would be equally careful in forming it, if it had been intended, in the name of Kanishka's father.

In the first syllable of this name, the short *a* may easily mean a long *ā*. And it is of course immaterial whether we take an *e* or an *i* in the second syllable. The names of Kanishka I and Huvishka are found written both with *i* and with *e*. And we may easily imagine, for the same reason, that the name of Vāsishka also was sometimes written as Vāeshka. But I cannot agree that the name, be it even Vājshesha or Vājshisha, 'sounds so like Vāsishka' (or Vāeshka) that we may take both it and Vāsishka as 'attempts to reproduce one and the same barbarous name in the characters of the Indian alphabet.' In support of this proposal, Professor Lüders has cited the point that the coins of the Indo-Greek king Zōilos show his name as Jhoila in the Kharoṣṭhī legends on the reverse. I submit that this gives no analogy, and no

## THE QUESTION OF KANISHKA

ground for thinking that the real name of the father of Kanishka II may have been Vāśishka or Vāsishka, and that its *z* could be represented by *jh* or *s* optionally. The name which is given unmistakably as Vāsishka in the Brāhmi inscription of the year 24 would be quite naturally presented as Vasishka in any Kharoṣṭhī record: and there is no good reason for suggesting that the *s* stands in the Brāhmi inscription for anything else.

In any case, as there were certainly two Kanishkas, why may not there have been also two Vāsishkas? We are dealing rather largely in conjectures: and this one seems to be as good as any other. But we need not in my opinion, fall back on any such expedient as this: we do not admit the identity of the names Vāsishka and Vājshesha or Vājshesha.

Professor Luders thus arrives at the following succession Kanishka I, with dates ranging from the year 3 to the year 11; then (Vājshesha)-Vasishka, with dates in the years 24 and 28, and then Kanishka II with a date in the year 41.

This, however, does not fit in very readily with the fact that we have for Huviska amongst other dates not only one in the year 51 in the record on the Waidak vase, which, again, comes from the Kharoṣṭhī country, but also one in the year 33 in a Brāhmi inscription from Mathurā, and in fact three or four others earlier than the year 41 in records of the same class.

Accordingly, Professor Luders suggests that after Vāsishka there was a division of the kingdom, Kanishka II receiving the northern parts and Huviska taking the territory in India proper, and that subsequently before the year 51, Huviska gained possession of also the northern territory.

This suggestion reads very smoothly. But it is hardly convincing: we cannot quote any Indian analogy in

support of it; such an arrangement does not seem at all naturally probable; and Professor Lüders himself admits that it is problematical.

Before the word which gives the name of the father, there stand, in line 1, the titles of Kanishka II. Three of them are unmistakable: they are the Kushan imperial titles *Maharaja*, *Rajātiraja*, and *Draputra*; all as separate genitives in apposition with *Kanishkama* in line 2. After these there comes something which is the crux of the present matter.

Mr Banerji read here *pat'itadharasa*, but did not explain it. Professor Lüders reads *[ka][sa]rasa*, "of the Karsara the Caesar".

This proposal is no new thing to me. Professor Lüders broached it to me more than three years ago. We discussed it. And we agreed (I thought) that, even if the reading could be accepted which seemed doubtful, it would not affect the question of BC. 58 as the initial date of Kanishka I but would adapt itself to any such application of the Ara inscription as that which I shall indicate farther on. However I have now to face a disagreement on this point.

Whether the reading *ktasuras*, giving a title which would be found now for the first time in any Indian record, may or may not be accepted, I am not able to decide. I can only say that not one of the syllables is certain, except the second *sa*.<sup>1</sup> and that no help for or against this or any other particular decipherment is given by other impressions which, in consequence of the point

<sup>1</sup> Professor Lüders agrees that the first syllable may be either *ka* or *pa*, damaged in either case. What comes next seems to stand rather too low to be an *i*: it might be the lower part of a conjunct consonant (perhaps *sa*) of which the top is damaged. The next mark certainly looks like part of a *sa*. The next one after that might be, I think, a *sa* or *da* as much as a *ra*.



being raised, I then obtained from India through the kindness of Dr. Spooner.

Against it we have to note a point which has been overlooked by Professor Liders; namely, that a word of five syllables does not suffice to fill out line 1 of the record. As is shown by his decipherment of the whole text, lines 2 to 5 have nothing wanting at the ends of them, though line 6 is now imperfect. Lines 2 to 5 all end exactly one below the other. We have no reason for thinking that the writer of the record would not run out line 1 to just the same measure. A reference to the facsimile will show that either reading, *pathadharaṣa* or *kāṣaraṣa*, or any other reading of five syllables, leaves a space for two syllables unaccounted for after it. We can also see distinct indications that the writer did, in fact, put in two more syllables here and so did make all the lines of equal length<sup>1</sup>. And it seems not unlikely that the second of these two syllables is itself a *sa* whether as a genitive-ending or with any other meaning.

If these two illegible syllables are part of the same word, (and it is difficult to find in them still another title, also in the genitive) that word ceases to be at any rate simply *kāṣaraṣa* and might assume a different complexion altogether with no such reference at all<sup>2</sup>.

But, also, these two syllables may be part of the name of the father of Kanishka II which comes immediately

This is clear in the facsimile, and still more so in some of the impressions received from Dr. Spooner, though they do not suffice to show what the two syllables are.

<sup>1</sup> Altogether there are seven syllables not five—we might find in them the genitive of a title of six syllables not four as we have in *kāṣaraṣa*; or, but less probably, two genitives of a title of two syllables followed by one of three syllables. In the Zista inscription, before *Kanishkasa rapasa* there are two words, two *ra* (as *rapasa mardabasa*, which seem to be Indian or Asian royal titles but have not been explained yet—we may have here another puzzle of the same kind. There is also a title which remains to be deciphered on one of the coins of Wankī, Kādphura, No. 26 in Gardner's catalogue.

next, at the beginning of line 2 ; in which case that name would cease to be simply Vajheshpa or Vajheshka. So, while the reading *kañishka* remains open to question on more than one ground, we will admit it for the sake of argument.

We have, then, to consider next what bearing it might have.

In the first place, Professor Liders places Kanishka II before Huvishka and Vāsudēva. But is it credible that such a title as Kaisara, Caesar, should have been adopted by a predecessor of Huvishka, and should not have figured always in the records mentioning Huvishka and Vāsudēva ?

The full titles of the Kushan kings, indeed, were not given in all the records. But it seems to me out of the question that so marked a title as this one, borrowed from Imperial Rome, could ever have been ignored and omitted from subsequent records if once it had been assumed by any member of the line. Is not this consideration sufficient at any rate to place Kanishka II after Huvishka and Vāsudēva ?

In the second place, to what period would the use of such a title by the Kushans lead us ?

Professor Liders appears to hold that the name Caesar cannot have become sufficiently well established and notorious as a title of the Roman emperors to be borrowed by an Indian king at so early a time as only 41 years after B.C. 58, that is, in B.C. 17.<sup>1</sup> What is it, then, that he suggests in the other direction ?

I take that to be his meaning when he says :—“It is naturally incredible that a ruler of Central Asia or India could assume the name Caesar as a title in the year 16 A.C.” My present opinion is certainly not in favour of dating any adoption of the title by a Kushan king from that time. Still, we must remember that there had then already been two famous Caesars,—Julius Caesar and Caesar Augustus ; and that the record of them received an Indian embassy in the winter of A.C. 20-19.

† He is inclined, though not very positively, and subject to the possibility that we might be concerned with 'a later Vāsudēva', to identify Vāsudēva with a king whom the Chinese records mention as Po-t'iao, king of the Yue-chi, and who, they tell us, sent an embassy to China in A.D. 229. As we have dates for Vāsudēva ranging from the year 74 to the year 98, it would follow (he says) that the Kushan era may have begun at the earliest in A.D. 130 and at the latest in A.D. 168. We will take the earlier limit, with the result that the Ara inscription falls in A.D. 170.

The name Caesar, as an appellation of the head of the Roman State, started with Julius Caesar, to whom it belonged by birth.<sup>1</sup> It was assumed on adoption, by his grand-nephew and successor Octavianus better known as Augustus from the title which was given to him by the Roman senate and people in B.C. 27. It was transmitted by Augustus, together with his own title, to his successors. And undoubtedly it was a very leading designation along with Augustus and Imperator, of all the Roman emperors down to a certain time and was probably the particular appellation by which they were most generally known and spoken of in popular usage in the western parts of the empire, though we may doubt whether the same was the case in the eastern parts.

But there was an important change in the time of Hadrian (A.D. 117-38). He dropped the name Caesar as a title of the emperor, and gave to it the application which it continued to bear after his time—namely, he transferred it to the second person in the state, the intended successor to the throne. And though he did

<sup>1</sup> I base the following remarks chiefly on statements under the word Caesar in Smith's Classical Dictionary and Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities, and in Lewis and Short's Latin Dictionary. But I have tried, as usual, to follow the matter up for myself; and as far as I can do that, the facts are exactly in accordance with those statements.

not make a Caesar till A.D. 136, when he adopted and appointed L. Aelius Verus, his coins show that he abandoned the use of the title by himself in A.D. 125.<sup>1</sup>

Thus, from A.D. 125 the name Caesar was no longer a title of the emperors, but had only a subordinate value. The Ara inscription, as we have seen, is not to be placed before A.D. 170; and even Kanishka I is not to be put before A.D. 130. We are thus confronted by the position that the name Caesar was taken up by a Kushan king as an imperial title in imitation of the Roman emperors when it had ceased to be a title of those emperors themselves. And this is sufficient in itself, I think, to upset Professor Liders' application of this Kushan record.

Whether the Ara inscription does or does not attach the title Kaisara, Caesar, to the name of Kanishka II, what it does establish is, in my opinion, that after the time of Vāsudēva there was a revival of the line of the great Kanishka. And there are, I think, other indications of this.

We find one notably in the Māpikiāla inscription, for the latest treatment of which we are also indebted to Professor Liders.<sup>2</sup> We can see now that this record is not dated, as was supposed, "in the year 18 of the great king Kaneshka". The genitive *Kaneshkama* is governed, not by the *sam* 10 4 4 which stands before it, but by what comes after it. And the record tells us that:—"In the year 18 [of some unspecified reckoning] the general Lala, an increaser of the Gushana race of the great king Kaneshka, erected a Stūpa," etc., etc. The expression *varish-samvardhaka*, 'increaser of the race,'

<sup>1</sup> See accounts of his coinage in the *Rivista Italiana di Numismatica*, 1906, pp. 228-74, and the *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1912, pp. 296-302. I am indebted to Mr. Allan for referring me to these two instructive papers.

<sup>2</sup> This Journal, 1909, 645.

marks Iala himself as a Kushan, and probably as an actual descendant of Kanishka I. And the construction leaves us free to apply the date "in the year 18" in any way that may seem proper.

The view, which I have held for some time, that this Māyikiāla inscription indicates a revival of the line of Kanishka I at some time after A.D. 50, will explain at once why the deposit of coins along with the record includes coins of Kozoulo-Kadphises and Wema-Kadphises (Kujula-Kasa and Vima-Kapthiśa) as well as of Kanishka I, and also certain Roman coins the presence of which in view at any rate of their worn or damaged condition, seems incompatible with the view that the deposit can have been made in the year 18 as equivalent to B.C. 40.

The innermost deposit, the nucleus of the whole inside a gold cylinder consisted of four gold coins of Kanishka I. Round outside that cylinder, and inside a silver cylinder, there were seven silver Roman coins, viz. one of Julius Caesar, one of Mark Antony, one of apparently Augustus, and four which have not been conclusively assigned but perhaps are all of the consular period and date from not after B.C. 43. The silver cylinder was inside a copper cylinder. Round about the latter and inside the stone niche in which it lay, there were eight copper coins,<sup>1</sup> among which we recognize four of Kanishka I, one of Kozoulo-Kadphises and one of Wema-Kadphises. And on the top of the stone which covered the niche there were four copper coins, three of Kanishka I and one of Wema-Kadphises.

The deposit of four coins of Kanishka I and no others inside the innermost cylinder is in perfect harmony with the nature of the dedication which was a posthumous one to the memory of that king and the honour of his

<sup>1</sup> So, at least, according to the published account, JASB. 3, 1891, 364, but only seven are shown in plate 32; and one of these is unrecognizable.

race. The Roman coins, with no others accompanying them, seem to have been included as interesting curios. And for the rest, the mixture of coins of Kanishka I along with those of the two Kadphises kings illustrates the currency which prevailed when the deposit was made, and suggests the 18th year of Wema-Kadphises as the time when the Stūpa was built and the revival of the line of Kanishka I was being contemplated.

There can be shown, I think also other indications of such a revival. But here for the present at least, I must stop. This note will suffice, I hope to make two things clear.

(1) Kanishka II is not to be placed before Huvishka and Vasudēva, and no question connected with him can affect n.c. 58 as the initial date of Kanishka I.

(2) If Kanishka II had the title Karsara, Caesar the adoption of it by him cannot be placed after about A.D. 125 at the latest.



## VII

### TOKHARIAN PRATIMOKSA FRAGMENT

By PROFESSOR SYLVAIN LÉVI

(COMMUNICATED BY DR. RUDOLF HOERNLE)

[This fragment, as well as a number of others, written in the Tokhari language and in Slanting Gupta characters, were forwarded to me from Simla by the Government of India, in April, 1907. In the forwarding letter it was stated that they had been "found at Jigdalik and Kaya, near Kuchar", by a man of Kuchar, called Sahib Ali. From Sahib Ali's report it appears that Jigdalik lies one day's march from Bai, and that the manuscript fragments were dug out by him from what he calls "a house", situated in "the hills" near Jigdalik. The term "house" is applied by the natives of Eastern Turkestan to what we call a *stûpa*, or shrine, see Sir Aurel Stein's *Ancient Khotan*, vol. i, p. 483. The name Jigdalik, as M. Pelliot informs me, is not uncommon in Chinese Turkestan, and signifies simply a place of oleasters. The Jigdalik fragments will be published in my projected series of volumes of *Manuscripts from Eastern Turkestan*; but as there will still be some delay in the issue of the first volume, I gladly accept the hospitality of the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society to give an early specimen of Professor Sylvain Lévi's careful edition of them. A glossary of the fragment, as well as linguistic notes, by Professor Meillet, are now in my hands, and will be published with the fragment itself and its facsimile in the forthcoming first volume of my series.—R. H.]

HOERNLE MS., No. 149<sup>2</sup>

*Provenance*.—O.N.O. de Koutchar. Trouvé par Sahib Ali dans le voisinage de Bai.

*Dimensions*.—292 x 47 mm. Un feuillet sans marges, à peu près intact, sauf une légère échancrure au bas. Le trou pour la ficelle est percé à 7 cm. du bord gauche. Hauteur moyenne des caractères, 2 mm.





Versu

(1) ranka ntse pelaiyknesso wattaro wātko tākañ  
amplākante parra tsenkedhar pāyti LXXVII (se samā)ne  
pañākte ntse mañādh yamaññam pāyti LXXVIII se  
sa[māne].

(2) modh mālā trikelye sa fakao yokam pāyti LXXIX  
se samāne<sup>1</sup> katkos preko amplākante kwañai ne yit-  
maññam pāyti LXXX se samāne nauñ tsanka—

(3) sa poedharñ āitnalyñe sa rank miyimañ pāyti  
LXXXI se samāne yaka yañ<sup>2</sup> sa lānte kereyen ne  
yam parna tuyknesa şarua mem-pāyti LXXXII kuñe  
samāne (prā)[ti].

(4) moq(s) po āñm sa nu klyausam pāyti LXXXIII  
se samāne ayāse kemesse suekar yamaññam pāyti  
LXXXIV se samāne pir maticak yamaska yamtsa  
yamaññalle.

71. Sv.P. 若比丘與賊衆議共道行·乃至到  
一聚落·波夜提·

“Si un bhikṣu, de propos délibéré, fait route avec une  
troupe de brigands, et qu’il va jusqu’à un village, il est  
*pa-pa-ti*.”

= PAC. 66. *Yo pama bhikkhu janani theyyamatthena  
saddham saviññahya ekadhamamaggam paṭipajjeyya  
antimaso pamarutaram pi paṭicittiya.*

“Si un bhikṣu, en connaissance de cause, se met en  
route après entente préalable avec une troupe de brigands,  
et va en leur compagnie ne fût-ce qu’au prochain village,  
*paṭicittiya*.”

T. “Le bhikṣu qui fait route par entente avec des  
voleurs, des brigands, pāyti.”

(Cf. Mv. 261. 75 [71<sup>e</sup> śikṣāpada]; *steyavārthagamanam*.)

<sup>1</sup> Sc MS.

<sup>2</sup> La syllabe *ya*, d’abord omise, a été rétablie après coup au-dessous  
de la ligne.

72. Sv.P. 若比丘·不滿二十歲人與受具足戒·波夜提·是人不得戒·諸比丘亦可呵·是事法爾·

"Si un bhikṣu à un homme qui n'a pas vingt ans accomplis donne intégralement les Défenses, il est *po-ye-t'i*. Cet homme n'a pas reçu les Défenses, et les bhikṣus sont à blâmer. Telle est la règle du cas."

= Pāc. 65. *Yo puna bhikkhu jānaṃ anarisaṃsaṃ puggalaṃ upasampādeyya so ca puggalo anupasaṃpanno te ca bhikkhū gārayhā idam tvaṃ pācittiyaṃ.*

"Si un bhikṣu, en connaissance de cause, ordonne une personne de moins de vingt ans, cette personne n'est pas ordonnée, et les bhikṣus sont à blâmer. Tel est dans ce cas le pācittiya."

T. "Le bhikṣu qui fait l'upasampādāna d'une personne qui a moins de vingt ans, il est pāyti. Celle-ci n'est pas upasāpanna; les bhikṣus sont à blâmer."

(Cf. Mvy. 261. 76 [72° śikṣāpada]: *ānariṃsatiṃsaṃ upasampādānam.*)

73. Sv.P. 若比丘·自手掘地·若使人掘·若指示言掘是·皮夜提·

"Si un bhikṣu, de sa propre main, creuse la terre, s'il la fait creuser par quelqu'un, si en l'indiquant de la main il dit de la creuser, il est *po-ye-t'i*."

= Pāc. 10. *Yo puna bhikkhu pathaviṃ khaṇeyya vā khaṇāpeyya vā pācittiyaṃ.*

"Si un bhikṣu creuse la terre ou la fait creuser, pācittiya."

T. "Le bhikṣu qui de sa propre main creuse la terre ou qui la fait creuser, pāyti."

(Cf. Mvy. 261. 77 [73° śikṣāpada]: *khaṇam.*)

74. Sv.P. 若比丘·受四月自恣請·若遇暴受者·波夜提·除常自恣請·除數數自恣請·除獨自恣請·

"Si un l'iksu accepte une invitation de pleine-liberté (= *praveru m*) pour quatre mois, et qu'il accepte encore au-delà, il est *pu-ye-t*, sauf invitation de pleine-liberté permanente, sauf invitation de pleine-liberté répétée, sauf invitation de pleine-liberté spéciale."

= Pāc. 47. *Agilānena bhikkhunā cātumdaṃpaccāya-pavāraṇa additabbā aññatru paṇapavāraṇāya aññatru niccāpavāraṇāya . tato ca ullari aññiyeyya pācittiyaṃ.*

"Un bhikkhu qui n'est pas malade doit accepter une invitation de fournitures pour quatre mois, en dehors d'une invitation répétée, en dehors d'une invitation permanente. S'il accepte en surplus, pācittiya."

T. "L'invitation personnelle d'un bhikṣu pour la conclusion des quatre mois doit être acceptée; s'il accepte en surplus de cela, pāyiti."

(Cf. Mv. 261. 78 [74 śikṣāpada]: *pravaritarthakāraṇi*.)

75. Sv.P. 若比丘·說戒時如是言·我今未學是戒·先當問諸比丘·隨修多羅毗尼阿毗曇者·波夜提 若比丘·欲得法利·是戒中應學·亦應問諸比丘·隨修多羅毗尼阿毗曇者·應如是言·大德·是語有何義·是事法爾·

"Si un bhikṣu, au moment de dire une Défense, parle ainsi. Moi, je n'apprends pas encore cette Défense; je veux d'abord interroger les bhikṣus qui récitent le Sūtra, le Vinaya, l'Abhidharma: il est *pu-ye-t*. Si un bhikṣu désire obtenir le profit de la Loi, il doit apprendre ces Défenses, et aussi il doit interroger les bhikṣus qui récitent le Sūtra, le Vinaya, l'Abhidharma, et il doit leur parler ainsi: Bhadantas: cette expression, quel sens a-t-elle? Voilà la règle de ce cas."

= Pāc. 71. *Yo piṇṇa bhikkhu bhikkhūhi sahadham-nikamā vuccamāno evaṃ vadēyya . na tāvhiṃ dhamma-dāminā sikkhāpade sikkhissāmi yeva na aññam*

*bhikkhum byuttam vinayudharam paripucchāmi  
pācittiyam . sikkhāmānena bhikkhure bhikkhuna aññu-  
tabbass paripucchitabbam paripaṇhitabbam . ayaṃ  
tathā sāsatei.*

Les bhikṣu à qui des bhikṣus disent une formule de la Loi et qui parle ainsi : Je ne m'instruirai pas — jusqu'à vie — dans cette prescription jusqu'à ce que je questionne un bhikṣu éclairé, porteur du Vinaya : — pācittiya. Un bhikṣu, ô bhikṣus ' qui s'instruit doit apprendre, doit questionner, doit se demander. C'est là la norme.

T. " Le bhikṣu qui, en récitant le Prātimokṣa-sūtra, parle ainsi : Ce n'est pas clair pour moi ! J'agis sur le dire des ignorants ! Je veux interroger quelqu'un qui sait le Sūtra, le Vinaya l'Abhidharma, pāyti "

(Cf. Mv. 261. 80 [76° śikṣāpāda] : *Sikṣopamāṇahūra-pratīkṣepaṭh* )

76. S. P 若比丘 諸比丘鬪亂諍訟時·屏處默然立聽 卽是念 諸比丘所說 我當憶持·波夜提

' Si un bhikṣu, alors que les bhikṣus se querellent et se disputent, se tient dans une cachette en silence et les écoute en pensant ainsi : Les bhikṣus, ce qu'ils disent, je veux me le rappeler il est paye ti ! "

— PĀC 78 *Yo puṇa bhikkhu bhikkhūnaṃ bhaḍḍanaṃ paṇanam kalandapaṇanam vāḍapamāṇanam apasāṇam tathāya yam ima bhikkhūnaṃ tam vossāṇā etad eva paccayam karitvā amānātam pācittiyam*

" Un bhikṣu qui tandis que les bhikṣus sont en discussion, sont en querelle, tombent en désaccord, se tient à portée d'oreille en pensant ' Ce qu'ils diront, je l'entendrai ' avec ce motif et sans autre motif. pācittiya. "

T. " Le bhikṣu que se tient à portée d'oreille des bhikṣus tandis qu'ils profèrent ( ? ) (w) [skemaṇṇaṇṇa] ? ) des propos violents, pāyti "

(Cf. Mv. 261. 79 [75° śikṣāpāda] : *apaśravagataṃ* )

77. Sv.P. 若比丘·僧斷事時默然起去·波夜提·

"Si un bhikṣu, quand le saṅgha tranche une affaire, en gardant le silence se lève et part, il est *po-ye-t'i*."

= Pac. 80. *Yo pana bhikkhu saṅghe viniścaya-  
bhāṣaya vāṭṭamāṇaṃ chandam adāsa upphayessanā  
pācittiyam.*

"Le bhikṣu qui, alors qu'une affaire à décider est en cours devant le saṅgha, sans donner son consentement préalable, se lève de son siège et s'en va, *pācittiya*."

T. "Le bhikṣu qui, quand une affaire de loi du saṅgha est en train d'être réglée, sans autorisation se lève pour sortir, *pāyti*."

(Cf. Mv. 261 81 [77<sup>e</sup> śikṣāpāda]: *tanūmāviprakramam*.)

78. Sv.P. 若比丘·輕他比丘·波夜提

Si un bhikṣu manque de respect à un autre bhikṣu, il est *po-ye-t'i*."

= Pac 54 *anadaraṇe pācittiyam.*

En cas de manque de respect, *pācittiya*."

T. "Le bhikṣu qui fait mépris du Bouddha, *pāyti*."

(Cf. Mv. 261 82 [78<sup>e</sup> śikṣāpāda] *anadaraṇam*.)

79. Sv.P. 若比丘飲酒·波夜提

"Si un bhikṣu boit de l'alcool il est *po-ye-t'i*."

= Pac 51 *sukumariyagāme pācittiyam.*

"Si on boit des liqueurs alcooliques ou fermentées, *pācittiya*."

T. "Le bhikṣu qui boit en excès comptable (f) de l'alcool, *pāyti*."

(Cf. Mv. 261. 83 [79<sup>e</sup> śikṣāpāda]: *sukumariyagāma dyapānam*.)

80. Sv.P. 若比丘·非時入聚落·不白善比丘·波夜提·除因緣·

"Si un bhikṣu hors temps entre dans un village sans informer un bon bhikṣu, il est *po-ye-t'i*, sauf raisons."

= Pāc. 85. *Yo pana bhikkhu santam bhikkhum anāpucchā vikāle gāmanī paviseyya aññatra tathārūpā accāyikā karuṇīyā pācittiyaṃ.*

"Le bhikṣu qui sans demander l'autorisation à un bon bhikṣu entre hors temps dans un village, à moins d'affaire urgente conforme, pācittiya."

T. "Le bhikṣu qui, le temps en étant passé, sans autorisation entre dans un village, pāyti."

(Cf. Mvy. 261. 84 [80<sup>e</sup> śikṣāpada]: *akālacarya*.)

81. Sv.P. 若比丘·請食食前食後行至餘家·  
波夜提·

"Si un bhikṣu invité à un repas, avant le repas ou après le repas va en tournée dans d'autres maisons, il est *po-ye-t'i*."

= Pāc. 46. *Yo pana bhikkhu nimantito subhatto samāno santam bhikkhum anāpucchā purebhattam vā pacchābhattam vā kuleṇ cārittam āpajjeyya aññatra samayā pācittiyaṃ . tathāyaṃ samayo . cīvarodāna-samayo cīvarakārasamayo . ayaṃ tathā samayo.*

"Le bhikṣu qui étant invité, déjà pourvu d'un repas, sans demander (l'autorisation) à un bon bhikṣu, soit avant le repas, soit après le repas, se met à faire une tournée dans les familles—sauf le temps légal,—pācittiya. Le temps légal, c'est le temps où on donne la vêtue le temps où on fait la vêtue. C'est là le temps légal."

T. "Le bhikṣu qui avant, par station, après, par séance (?), nuit au saṅgha, pāyti."

(Cf. Mvy. 261. 85 [81<sup>e</sup> śikṣāpada]: *kulacarya*.)

82. Sv.P. 若比丘·刹帝利王未聽許·夜未曉未盡寶·若過門闕·波夜提·除因緣·

"Si un bhikṣu, chez un roi kṣatriya qui a reçu l'ordination du sacre, quand la nuit ne s'éclaircit pas encore, quand on n'a pas encore serré les joyaux, dépasse le seuil de la porte, il est *po-ye-t'i*, sauf raison."

= Pāc. 83. *Yo pana bhikkhu rañño khattiyassa mudāhārasittassa anikkhantarajake aniggaturatunake pubbe appaṭisaṁvāritito indakkhilaṁ atikkāmeyya pācittiyaṁ.*

"Le bhikṣu qui, chez un roi ksatriya qui a reçu l'onction royale, quand le roi n'est pas sorti, quand les joyaux [le comm. explique: la reine] ne sont pas sortis, sans s'être annoncé au préalable, dépasse le seuil, pācittiya."

T. "Le bhikṣu qui, en mendiant, la nuit, va dans le palais du roi, en dehors d'un motif conforme, pāyti."

(Cf. Mv. 261. 86 [82<sup>e</sup> śikṣāpada]: *rajakularatricarya*. Mais nous possédons ici le texte même de la prescription du Mūla-Sarvāstivāda Vinaya, conservée avec son commentaire dans le Mākaṇḍika du Divyāvadāna, p. 543 sq.

*Yathā punar bhikṣur anigatayam rajanyam anudgate 'rune anirhateṣu ratneṣu ratnasammatheṣu va rājāḥ ksatriyaṣu mārddhabhṣiktasya indrakilaṁ va indrakilasamantam va samatikrameṣu anyatra tadṛṣṇat pratyagat pāyantika.*

"Le bhikṣu qui, quand la nuit n'est pas encore passée, quand l'aurore n'est pas levée, quand ne sont pas encore retirés les joyaux ou ce qu'on tient pour des joyaux, chez un roi ksatriya qui a reçu l'onction royale, dépasse le seuil de la porte ou les alentours du seuil, sauf motif conforme, pāyantika."

La tradition variait donc entre *rajake*, "le roi," et *rajant*, "la nuit."

83. Sv.P. 若比丘·說戒時如是言·我今始知是法說戒經中半月半月·戒經中說·諸比丘知是比丘乃至若二若三說戒中坐·何況多是比丘不以不知故得脫·隨所犯罪如法治·應兩舍·故大德·故失無利·故不善·故說戒時不敬戒·不作是念·實有是事·不貴重·不善心中·不一心念·不攝耳聽法從彼事·彼我提·



" Si un bhikṣu, au moment de réciter les Défenses, patimokkha ainsi : C'est maintenant que j'apprends pour la première fois que cette Loi est énoncée dans le Livre des Défenses, est-écritée tous les demi-mois dans le Livre des Défenses. Les bhikṣus savent que ce bhikṣu a siégé déjà deux fois, trois fois à plus forte raison davantage, pendant qu'on récitait les Défenses ; ce bhikṣu ne peut pas, à cause de son ignorance, obtenir d'être excusé. Selon sa faute, de la manière que la loi prescrit, il faut le traiter : Toi, bhādanta, toi tu as failli, tu n'auras pas d'avantage, tu n'es pas bien, quand on récite les Défenses, tu n'honores pas les Défenses, tu ne penses pas que en vérité il en est ainsi : tu ne les vénères pas, tu n'y appliques pas ton cœur, tu n'y penses pas en concentrant ton esprit, tu n'écoutes pas et tu ne suis pas la Loi. Par conséquent, *yo ye-t'i.*"

~ PÂ 73 *Yo paṇa bhikkhu anuvaddhamasam patimokkhe uddissamāne evam vadeyya . idam eva kho aham jānāmi ayam pi kira dhammo suttoṃpi suttopariya-piṇṇo anuvaddhamasam uddesam aqucchati taṃ ca bhikkhum aññe bhikkhū jāneyyum nissinnapabbatam imāni bhikkhuna dṛṭṭikkhattum patimokkhe uddissamāne ko paṇa vado bhayya na ca tassa bhikkhuno aññātakena mutthi utthi yān ca tattha aputtim opariṇa tuṃ ca yathudhammo karatabbo uttari eva moho aropetabbo . tassa te aramā alabha tassa te dānādānam yam tam patimokkhe uddissamāno an sūbhukam atthakata manasikaranti idam tasmā mohanake jareṭṭiyam*

" Le bhikṣu qui, à la lecture du Prātimokṣa tous les demi-mois, vient à parler ainsi : C'est maintenant seulement que je sais que telle est la Loi qui se trouve dans le Sūtra, qui est recueillie dans le Sūtra, qui revient en récitation tous les demi-mois, si les autres bhikṣus savent que ce bhikṣu a déjà siégé deux fois, trois fois à plus forte raison davantage, pendant la récitation du

**Prātimokṣa** : un bhikṣu n'est point quitte à cause de son ignorance, il faut lui appliquer le traitement que la Loi prescrit pour sa faute, et il faut de plus l'accuser de folie : Voilà ce que tu as manqué à gagner ; voilà un fâcheux profit pour toi, parce que pendant la récitation du Prātimokṣa tu ne te recueilles pas bien, tu ne t'appliques pas. C'est là le pācittiya en cas d'égarement."

T. " Le bhikṣu qui n'écoute pas le Prātimokṣa de tout son cœur, pāyti."

(Cf. Mv. 261. 87 [83<sup>e</sup> śikṣāpada] : *śikṣāpadudravya-bhayaṃcārak* )

84. Sv.P. 若比丘·若骨若齒若角作針筍·  
波夜提·

" Si un bhikṣu fait un étui à aiguilles en os, en ivoire, en corne *po-ye-t'i* "

= Pāc. 86. *Yo pana bhikkhu aññamayam va danta mayam va cīśummayam va aññigharum karapeyya bhedanakam pācittiyam*

" Le bhikṣu qui fait faire un étui à aiguilles en os, ou en ivoire, ou en corne, pācittiya d'infraction."

T. " Le bhikṣu qui se fait un étui à aiguilles en os ou en corne, pāyti."

(Cf. Mv. 261. 88 [84<sup>e</sup> śikṣāpada]. *aññighakasmājanadanam*.)

85. Sv.P. 若比丘·欲作坐牀臥牀·足應高  
八指·除入陸·若過作·波夜提·

" Si un bhikṣu veut se faire un siège ou un lit, la hauteur doit être exactement de huit doigts, sans compter les marches pour y atteindre. S'il dépasse cette mesure, il est *po-ye-t'i*."

= Pāc. 87. *navam pana bhikkhunā muticam vā piṭham vā kārayamānena aññagūlapāḍakam kāretabbam*

*sugataṅgulena aññatra heṭṭhinūya ataniya tañ at-ḷka-  
mayato cchedanakañ pācittiyam.*

"Si un bhikṣu se fait faire un lit ou un siège n'uf, il doit le faire faire de huit doigts en doigts du Sugata. déduction faite des marches posées au-dessous. Si on dépasse cette mesure, c'est un pācittiya de coupure."

T. " Le bhikṣu qui se fait un lit ou un siège, il faut le faire à la mesure . . . '

(Cf. Mvy. 261. 89 [85 śikṣāpada]: *vādakasam-  
pādanam.*)

## MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

### KANISHKA'S GREEK

Amidst the general confusion and conflict of opinion regarding the date of Kanishka one fact emerges; it seems to be generally agreed that Kozoulo Kadphises is to be assigned to the first, probably to the middle of the first, century of our era. Oldenberg and Lüders, the latest writers on the subject, apparently accept this date, and V. A. Smith gives A.D. 60 for Kozoulo Kadphises' conquest of Kabul.<sup>1</sup> I have given elsewhere the arguments, mainly derived from Chavannes and Franke, on which this conclusion is based.<sup>2</sup> And as Pan Yong gives us a nearly contemporary history of Northern India from this time onward to the last days of the Emperor Ngan (A.D. 107-25), the ground is wonderfully cleared. Pan Yong<sup>3</sup> tells us that Kozoulo Kadphises' son and successor, Wema Kadphises, conquered Northern India, and governed it through a viceroy, who, as I suggest elsewhere,<sup>4</sup> was probably the "Nameless King". This was the state of things at the date of Pan Yong's report (c. A.D. 120 or 125): his means of information were exceptionally good, and, until his statements are shown to be wrong, every theory which assigns Kanishka to any date between A.D. 60 and A.D. 120 is barred. We are obliged, therefore, to choose between two alternatives; we must either accept a second century Kanishka, or we must date him in the middle of the first century before our era.

<sup>1</sup> Lüders, *Sitzungsberichte d. königl. Preuss. Akademie d. Wissenschaften*, xxxviii, p. 830, July, 1912, merely says the first century of our era, but adds that he is in general agreement with Oldenberg, "Zur Frage nach der Ära des Kaniska," *NGGW.*, Phil. Hist. Kl. 1911. V. A. Smith, *Early History*, 2nd ed., p. 246.

<sup>2</sup> *JRAS.*, 1912, p. 678 ff.

<sup>3</sup> For Pan Yong c. *JRAS.*, 1912, p. 678, n. 2; *ibid.*, p. 681.

<sup>4</sup> *JRAS.*, 1912, n. 128.

## KANISHKA'S GREEK

Kanishka used the Greek language and Greek characters on his coins, and he used these alone. I have shown in "The Secret of Kanishka" that Greek was the *lingua franca* of trade in all the lands where Greeks had settled east of the Euphrates; and that it fell into general disuse at the commencement of the second century of our era.<sup>1</sup> Kanishka's use of Greek is therefore an essential factor in the Kanishka problem.

The only evidence we have of Kanishka's use of Greek is in the legends on his coins; and it has been suggested more than once that the Greek on these coins is a mere survival, as meaningless as the Latin on ours. Professor Lüders is the latest exponent of this view. "I have before me," he says, "a couple of foreign coins, one a Swiss nickel piece of 1900, the other a penny of 1897. On the first there stands an inscription *Confœderatio Helvetica*, on the penny *Victoria Dei Græ Britannia Regnans Fid. Def. Ind. Imp.* I am sorry for any historians two thousand years hence who may conclude that in A.D. 1900 Latin was the language of daily life in the mountains of Switzerland and in the British Isles."<sup>2</sup> The suggestion is by no means novel. Mr. Tarn had already advanced it in 1902, and others have said something of the kind. "It is always possible," said Mr. Tarn, "to argue that Greek on the coins remained as a dead token, as we use Latin, and, having suggested and discussed this view, he decided against it."<sup>3</sup> I have not directly referred to this argument in "The Secret of Kanishka", but I have given there at length the reasons for believing that Greek was understood and spoken in Kanishka's kingdom.<sup>4</sup> They are briefly these:—

*First.* Kanishka introduces a cursive script in common

<sup>1</sup> "The Secret of Kanishka," Parts II and III, *passim*, more especially pp. 993-4, 1000-17.

<sup>2</sup> Lüders, *op. cit.*, p. 431.

JEH., 1902, p. 262.

<sup>4</sup> In Parts II and III.

use for commercial and other purposes of daily life, the previously unknown on the Indian coinage. He also revives the use of the antiquated letter *au* to express the sounds of his native Turki.

*Second.* All Kanishka's predecessors, Greek or Scythic, employed both Greek and Prakrit legends on their coins. Kanishka drops the Prakrit and retains the Greek, a change which would be impossible had Greek been obsolete. It is certain, therefore, that Greek must have been written, read, and understood in the Panjāb at that time.

*Third.* Kanishka's Greek is often ungrammatical; he confounds the nominative and the genitive. This self-same blunder is repeated among the Greeks of Seleucia, but at a later date. When a people confounds the endings of its words we know that the language, though nigh to disappearing has not disappeared. Kanishka's bad grammar proves that he spoke Greek, although the Greek was barbarous.

*Fourth.* The Greeks of Arachosia and Kabul went on speaking Greek certainly to the middle, possibly to the end of the first century of our era. The Greeks of Rawal Pindi, more remote from Seleucia and more mixed with the native population may have discarded it somewhat earlier. But that Greek continued to be understood among them for a considerable time, is shown by the correct use of the Greek alphabet on the coins of Huvishka and Vāmadeva. Like Kanishka they employ the Greek character only, while Huvishka engraves the figure of Serapis, a deity which he borrowed from merchants of Greek speech.

Is it to be imagined that any dynasty could employ correctly on their coinage for one hundred years the alphabet of a language which had been completely forgotten, and that, too, the only alphabet they employ? Everywhere we find that when Greek fell into decay the

legends of the coins, whether on those of Nabapāna or the Arsacids, or of Characene, speedily became jumbled and corrupt.<sup>1</sup>

There is therefore no analogy whatever between the Greek, the single language of Kanishka's coins, and the Latin inscriptions complementary to the English on the coins of Great Britain. But let us grant for the sake of argument that an analogy exists; it will hardly prove what it is supposed to do. The Latin on our coins is, of course, for commercial purposes superfluous, a mere survival. But the Latin remains correct. And why? Because Latin is still in many respects a living language. It is used in the daily services of the Church throughout the half of Christendom, taught in every grammar school, and used for all academic purposes. Sermons are preached, discussions held, books and commentaries written, and epitaphs composed in it. One has occasionally to use it as a means of communication with foreigners. It is as much used as Sanskrit in India, as much used and more widely understood. I do not know what other language is equally common to the French, German, and Italian-speaking cantons of Switzerland. If it merely represented the hieroglyphics of a dead language it would have disappeared long ago. The analogy proves even more than it is required to do. It would prove that Greek was understood as long as the Greek of the coin legends remained correct.

J. KENNEDY.

#### HERAUS ὁ τιμωρὶς

Cunningham has devoted a whole article to the coins of a certain Heraus or Miaus<sup>2</sup> whose legend he reads thus *Τυραννοῦρος Μιῶου* [*Ηραου*] *Σαραθ* [*Σαραθου*] *Κοπεραου*

<sup>1</sup> For a fuller examination of the question I must refer the reader to "The Secret of Kanishka", more especially pp. 203 & 200 ff (JRAM, 1912).

<sup>2</sup> *Nouv. Chron.*, ser. III, vol. viii, pp. 47 &c. I quote from the reprint; cf. Rapson, *Indian Coins*, part. 33, p. 9.

On the oboli this is cut down to *Μίδου* [*Ἡρίου*] *Κερσίρου*, and on a copper chalkous we have the words *ῥαπ* and *αυ* [*αρε*] without the name. Heraus (or Miasus if you will) was therefore a Kushan, and the unintelligible *Σαρίβ* (= Sanav) or *Σαράβιν* is no part of his name, since it is omitted on the oboli. It probably represents some Turki title, which the engraver was unable to express perfectly in Greek letters. The fine portrait of Heraus<sup>1</sup> is typically Turki - the peaked skull, the long large nose, the prognathism of the face, the energetic chin. It has a generic likeness to the portraits of Kanishka and Wema Kadphises.

But it is the strange title of *τύραννος* which specially interests me. We used to think (it was Mr Gardner's suggestion)<sup>2</sup> that the Greeks of Afghanistan and Northern India indulged in strange and antiquated or poetical words, such as *κοίρανος* and *τύραννος*; that, in fact, they loved to use a kind of magniloquent Babu-Greek. The idea was interesting and natural, but unfortunately the supports on which it rested are giving way. *Κοίρανος* is now read as *κοράννος* or some other equivalent of Kushan. *Τύραννος* must follow suit, for the *Periplus* shows us that it had a very definite and limited meaning, it denoted a local ruler, a Rajah or Sheikh, who was not a king, ordinarily it meant a vassal or vassal-king. Thus, at Mouza one pays both to the *βασίλευς* and the *τύραννος*; τῷ δὲ βασιλεῖ καὶ τῷ τυράννῳ δίδονται ἵπποι κ.τ.λ. (c. 24). The tyrannos of the place is Cholabon, he lives three days' distance off at Sauē. ἔστι δὲ τύραννος καὶ αυτοκράτωρ αὐτῇ Χολαίβος (c. 22). Cholabon was a vassal of (Haribael, who was the king of the whole country: εἰθίσμος βασιλεὺς ἐθνῶν διὰ τοῦ τε Ὀμηρίτου καὶ τοῦ παρακειμένου λεγομένου Σαβαίτου (c. 23). Azania (Somaliland) on the African coast was under the tyrannos of Maphar,

<sup>1</sup> Cunningham, *op. cit.*, pl. III, 1; Rapson, *op. cit.*, pl. II, 1.

<sup>2</sup> P. Gardner, *Greek and Scythic Kings of Bactria and India*, p. III.



subject, however, to certain rights of the king of ἡ πρώτη Ἀραβία: νέμεται δε αὐτὴν, κατὰ τι δίκαιον ἀρχίων, ὑποπίπτουσιν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῆς πρώτης γενομένης Ἀραβίας ὁ Μαφαρίτης τύραννος (c. 16). So also it is said of another part of the East African littoral οὐ βασιλεύεται δε ὁ τόπος, ἀλλὰ τυρύνουσιν ἰδίῳις ἕκαστον ἐμπορίαν διοικεῖται (c. 14). The country is not under any king, but every mart has its own individual headman or sheikh. The pirates on that coast, every man of them, consider themselves as king and as any τύραννος (c. 16). Elsewhere we read of the two classes τῶν τυρύνων καὶ βασιλείων (c. 20).

We find, then, that on the quays of Barygaza and among the mariners of the Indian Ocean τυραννος meant a petty chief, usually a vassal of some king.

According to Cunningham, Heraus ruled in Western Afghanistan, where alone his coins are found, and Cunningham, on numismatic grounds made him a contemporary of Kozoulo Kadphises. He also uses on his coins the horseman type characteristic of the Sakas and the Indo-Parthians. We know that Kozoulo Kadphises took Kabul from the Indo-Parthians in the middle of the first century A.D., and that his son after conquering India, appointed a viceroy as governor. I conclude, therefore, that Heraus, this Kushan τυραννος in Western Kabul, was a vassal, no doubt a deputy of Kozoulo Kadphises, the Kushan βασιλεὺς. If this be so two corollaries will follow.

1. The participial form τυραννοῦντος shows that Greek must have been spoken with some correctness in Western Afghanistan in the middle of the first century A.D. Had the legend been a mere survival, we should certainly have expected τυραννος, and not the present participle which so happily conveys the idea that Heraus' rule was not a dynastic but a temporary one. It is in keeping with this that his coins have no Kharosthi legends.

2. Heraus cannot be *Yu-mo-fu*, as Cunningham (who,

dated Koxoulo Kadphises in the latter half of the first century A.C.) suggested, but with some hesitation. *In-mo-fu* belongs to the middle of the first century A.C., and ruled in Ki-pin, which in the time of the Han ordinarily meant Kashmir, and at no time ever meant Western Afghanistan

J. KENNEDY

### A PASSAGE IN THE PERIPLUS

In the forty-seventh chapter of the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea* the writer tells us what he had heard of the nations inhabiting Upper India. His account is vague and confused, much what we might expect a rather ignorant sailor to have picked up among the traders of Barygaza. Unfortunately our sole MS. (for the B.M. MS. and the *editio princeps* are merely transcripts from it), always corrupt, is here at its worst. The manuscript reading in question is as follows: ἐπικείται γὰρ κατὰ ταιτῇ Βαρυγίῃ κατὰ τὰ μεσόγεια πλείονα ἔθνη ἢ τε τῶν ἰνδιάνων καὶ ριχισίων καὶ ταιθαριῶν καὶ τῆς προκλίδος ἐν ἣ ἡ βουκεφαλὸς ἀλεξάνδρεια καὶ τούτων ἐπάνω μαχμώτατον ἔθνος βακτριανῶν ὑπὸ βασιλείᾳ οὖσαν ἰδίον τόπον. Fabricius, the latest editor (1883), prints it thus. ἐπικείται δὲ τοῖς Βαρυγίῃ κατὰ τὰ μεσόγεια πλείονα ἔθνη, τό τε τῶν Ἀραττιῶν καὶ Ἀραχουσιῶν καὶ Γανδαρῶν καὶ τῆς Προκλίδος, ἐν ἣ ἡ Βουκεφαλὸς Ἀλεξάνδρεια. Καὶ τούτων ἐπάνω μαχμώτατον ἔθνος Βακτριανῶν, ὑπὸ βασιλείᾳ ὄντων ἰδίον. All the translators are much to the same effect. I give Schoff's rendering, which is the latest: "The country inland from Barygaza is inhabited by numerous tribes, such as the Arattii the Arachosii, the Gandarii and the people of Prœlais, in which is Bucephalus Alexandria. Above these is the very warlike nation of the Bactrians, who are under their own king."

I am here concerned only with the concluding words of the second sentence as they stand in the MS., ὑπὸ βασιλείᾳ

οὐσαν ἴδιον τόπον. Fabricius' note, p. 80, shows the various attempts at emendation previously made. Since then Marquart has attacked the passage (Eranshahr, p. 210, n. 3). He blames Fabricius severely (but unjustly, I think) for having failed to produce a better reading. His own attempt, however, is by no means happy. He says that the author undoubtedly construed ἔθνος as a feminine noun, witness ἡ τε, etc., after πλείονα ἔθνη. Therefore we ought to read οὐσα, the final *ν* in οὐσαν being due to the avoidance of a hiatus. Τόπον he takes as a gloss on ἴδιον, which has crept into the text. He therefore reads the passage thus: *μαχιμώτατον ἔθνος ὑπὸ βασιλείᾳ οὐσα ἴδιον [ἐντόπιον]*. To this it may be answered that the author has twice over construed ἔθνος as a neuter, πλείονα ἔθνη and μαχιμώτατον ἔθνος; and we cannot admit that in the very same breath he would use it as a feminine. After ἡ τε one naturally understands χώρα. I see no difficulty in that.

Another solution recommends itself to me. We have two clues to guide us, the ordinary usage of the author, and the account of the Bactrians furnished us in the Chinese History of the Later Han. Now the writer of the *Periplus* mentions at least ten kings and rulers, and whenever he has occasion to mention a king he either gives us his proper name or his dynastic title, such as Kérobothras (c. 54), whichever name, I suppose, might be in use at the haven he was visiting. Occasionally he adds some words by way of explanation. Now, at the time of the *Periplus* (which I take to be between A.D. 80 and 100) the Kushans were ruling in Bactria, and during part of that time, at any rate, Wema Kadphises was their king. The kingdom was always known to the Westerns as the Kushan kingdom, and the king was probably spoken of by Ptolemy as the Kushan. I therefore take it that for οὐσαν we must read *Kushan*; and *ἴδιον* *Kushan* is in exact keeping with the usage of the author.

two words which follow, *ἰδιον τόπον*, cannot have been corrupted out of Wema Kadphises or any other Kushan name we know; they must be part of an explanatory clause. In that case some word must have dropped out not an infrequent occurrence--and the simplest word is *ἀρχοντα*.

*Τόπος* is one of the commonest words in the *Periplus*, and is sharply distinguished from *Βασιλεια* (cf. e.g. ch. 5, 14), it means a particular district which generally, but not always, forms part of a kingdom. The passage will then read thus *ὑπο Βασιλεια [Κ]ουσαρ [ἀρχοντα] ἰδιον τόπον* and the general sense will be that the Bactrians were under a Kushan king who directly ruled Bactria, implying thereby that his sovereignty extended over a much wider dominion.

This corresponds exactly with the account given in the History of the Later Han. We there read that when Wema Kadphises conquered Northern India he appointed a *chief* to administer it. This chief would appear to have been the so-called "nameless king" whose coins are found from Kabul and the Indus to Benares and Ghazipur, and whose name was doubtless suppressed for some religious scruple. His coins, according to Rapson (*Indian Coins* par. 67, p. 16) connect him at once both with Heraus and with Wema Kadphises. Cunningham possessed a coin on which there were two heads with the symbols of the nameless king and of Wema Kadphises. But the nameless king does not call himself *ῥύπαρος* or a mere deputy like Heraus, he takes the lofty title of ΒΑCΙΑΕΥC ΒΑCΙΑΕΥΩΝ [*sic*] CΩTHP ΜΕΓΑC, a title which he shares with Wema Kadphises. On the other hand, his coins, with the exception of one silver piece, are all in copper, while Wema Kadphises mints gold. The inference is that he was a member of the royal Kushan family, co-regent with, but subordinate to, Wema Kadphises.

What a pity that the author of the *Periplus* has not given us his name, and told us something definite about him!

J. KENNEDY.

### PROPOSED IDENTIFICATION OF TWO SOUTH-INDIAN PLACE-NAMES IN THE PERIPLUS

Among the few foreign records of ancient India one of the most trustworthy, so far as its limited scope admits, is the *Periplus Maris Erythrei* (written in the second half of the first Christian century), which gives us an exact account of the commercial ports of the western coast from the mouths of the Indus to Cape Comorin, and of the articles entering into the trade of each. Of the eastern coast little is said, and that little is hearsay picked up at some of the western ports; but even that is not without present value. Many of the place names in the *Periplus* are readily identified while others have been disputed by the commentators and have appeared and then disappeared from the classical geographies. Two of these, if the following identifications be correct will add to the understanding which the *Periplus* has given us of Southern India in that period.

Muziris and Neleynda the southern trading ports frequented by Greek and Arab shipping were first identified as Mangalore and Nilēshwar both in South Kanara, but their true location was shown by Gundert, Burnell, Caldwell, and Yule, to be much farther south, Muziris being identical with Muzirikkōtta or Cranganore, in Cochin. Neleynda seems rather to have been an appellation; Pliny speaks of the "city of the Neuryndi" Ptolemy of Melkynda, which Caldwell translated "Western Kyndi". Laying down the sailing course described in the *Periplus* between Muziris and Neleynda, and setting out from Cranganore, we should reach the modern

Kottayam, in Travancore, an early trade centre, located on a broad bay of the Cochin backwaters, and at the western terminus of several trade routes through the Pinnéd hills.

The text (§§ 34-5) describing the course south of Nelecynda says it was "situated on a river, about 120 stadia from the sea. there is another place at the mouth of this river, the village of *Bacure*, to which ships drop down on the outward voyage from Nelecynda, and anchor in the roadstead to take on their cargoes, because the river is full of shoals and the channels are not clear."<sup>1</sup> This place appears also in Ptolemy, with but one letter inserted as *Barkure*.

It is submitted that *Baxaph* or *Bupraph* is identical with Porakād in Travancore, on the coast (9° 22' N., 76° 22' E.) for which it is a close transliteration; while the distance from Kottayam is practically in exact accord with the text. Porakād was once a notable port. The Portuguese and subsequently the Dutch, had settlements there. Varthema in 1503 spoke of it as *Porcat*, and Tavernier in 1648 as *Porca*. The remains of a Portuguese fort are still visible there at low water although nearly submerged by encroachment of the sea. By dredging a better passage between backwater and ocean, and constructing harbour works, Alleppey about ten miles to the north has now taken the place which Porakād formerly held in trade.<sup>2</sup> Porakād is, likewise, at the mouth of a river, the Achenkoil, which rises in the Ghats near the Shenkōtta Pass, the main highway between Travancore and Tinnevely.

Passing down the coast, the text speaks of the *Dark*

Ἰσχυται δὲ καὶ αὐτὴ παρὰ ποταμοῦ ὅσῳ ἀπὸ σταθίων ἀπὸ τοῦ εἰσεῖν τῆς θαλάσσης. Ἐπεὶ δὲ αὐτὸ τὸ πῦρ τοῦ ποταμοῦ πρὸκειται πρὸς ἡμᾶς, εἰς τὸ ἀπὸ Μολυβδίου ἐπὶ τῆς ἀπογραφῆς προσημαίνει τὴν ὁδὸν καὶ ἐπὶ ὅλῳ διακρίνεται πρὸς ἀλλήλους τῶν ποταμῶν διὰ δὲ τὸν ποταμὸν ἔχοντα καὶ ἀπολῶν ἔχον αἰὲν διακρίεσθαι.

**Imperial Government of India.**

*Red Mountain* (το λεγόμενον Πυρρὸν ὄρος), evidently the Red Bluffs at Varkkallai, in Travancore, on the coast, and of a port *Bulida*; which may perhaps be identified with Varkkallai (8° 42' N), formerly the southern terminus of the Cochin backwaters, which have now been extended, by cutting a canal through these same Red Bluffs, as far as Trivandrum, the modern trade centre for that district. The form *Balita*, if not corrupt, is short by both an *r* and a guttural from the modern Varkkallai.

Proceeding beyond Cape Comorin, the older classical geographers placed a gulf which they called *Sonus Argariticus*, and a port called *Argira*. Both have now disappeared from the maps. They were based on a misunderstanding of the following passage in the *Periplus* (§ 59): "Beyond Colehi there follows another district called the Coast Country, which lies on a bay and has a region inland called Argaru. At this place, and nowhere else, are bought the pearls gathered on the coast thereabouts, and from there are exported muslins those called Argaritic."<sup>1</sup>

The Coast Country of the *Periplus* (Αἰγιαλός) seems to be no other than the Chōla Coast still called Chōla māṇḍalam, which the Portuguese made into Coromandel, the Chōla kingdom, in short, the richest largest and most prosperous of the three Dravidian states as the *Periplus* asserts. And this leads to its capital, placed by the old geographers on the coast (although the text speaks of it as lying inland), and called *Argirou*.

It is submitted that this *Argirou* is identical with Uraiyūr, Oraiyūr, Warriore, the ancient capital of the Chōla kingdom, now part of Trichinopoly. The fine muslins known as Argaritic<sup>2</sup> do but confirm the

<sup>1</sup> Μουσὶν δὲ κέλονται διδόντες τούτοις τρυφεροὶ Αἰγαῖοι λεγόμενοι ἐν αὐτῷ πελάγει, ὅπου χάρις μυστρῶν, λεγομένων Ἀργαίων ἐν τοῖς τοῖς αὐτοῖς καὶ τῷ δουτίῳ. ἐν αὐτῷ δὲ τῷ πελάγει πολλοὶ μυστῶν αὐτῶν θησαυροὶ καὶ οἱ αὐτοὶ εὐδαιμόνιοι καὶ Ἀργαίτιδες λεγόμενοι.

well-known fact of the early supremacy of the Chôla people in textile manufacture. Some of the finest fabrics that reached the Roman world were of Chôla origin, and thence also came the fine gold-threaded embroideries brought westward by the Saracen merchants.

If Uraiyûr and *Αρρυου* be identical, the Greek transliteration becomes a matter of interest. Some commentators have unnecessarily assumed the name *Αρρυν* to be very corrupt. Perhaps the Greek form as originally written may have been *Αράριου* or *Αραρίου*, involving but a slight re-arrangement of the form given in the text.<sup>1</sup>

These identifications carry back to the first century of the Christian era two trade centres which were important throughout the Middle Ages, and must by their location have become important in an earlier age, whenever that part of India became politically organized - Poreni the port and Trichinopoly the city of industry. Incidentally they indicate the accuracy of the author of the *Periplus* as to a district concerning which his knowledge has not heretofore been generally allowed.

WILFRED H. SCHOFF.

PROBOKITHIA  
July, 1912

### IS THE RAMAYANA OF TULASI DASA A TRANSLATION ?

A committee of six pundits<sup>2</sup> has issued a curious edition of the *Âranya* and *Sundara Kândas* of the *Râma-caritamâmam* of Tulasi Dâsa. The interesting point about it

<sup>1</sup> [And it may be suggested that at some time or another, through the use of cursive forms, a *υ* has been mistaken for, and turned into, a *γ*, perhaps by some early copyist. - Ed.]

<sup>2</sup> P. Havarâmaji, P. Râmachandraharâraji, P. Râmanârâyana, P. Cintâmani Vaidyaratna, P. Baijnâth Dâsa, and P. Balabhadraprasâda Sâkha. The work can be obtained from the last-named gentleman who is Assistant Master at the Government High School, Ballia, O. P. The price of the *Âranya Kânda* is eight annas; that of the *Sundara Kânda* is not stated.





- बी०—पूछहीन कबहूँ जा रहि । तब ब्रह्म निज बाचहि कै जा रहि ॥  
 निज कर कीन्हैति ब्रह्मन बसाई । दैवान में निज की अनुजारी ॥  
 कबहूँ पुनः कवि नम मुकुटाया । नर वहास धारहूँ कै जा रहि ॥  
 बाहुबाध सुनि रावण बचवा । बाधि मूढ रचन सोर रचवा ॥  
 रक्षा न बबर बचन पुत तैसा । बाढी पूछ कीन्ह कवि कैसा ॥ ५ ॥  
 कीतुन कहीं बाधि पुरवासी । मारहिं परब कर्हिं ब्रह्म हौंसी ।  
 बाधहिं डोक देहिं सब तारी । बबर कैरि प्रभु पूछि प्रजारी ॥  
 पावक करत देखि हनुमंता । भयत परम अनुकूल तुरंता ॥  
 विबुध पडेन कवि कबहूँ जटारी । नहिं वसोत निवाचरजारी ॥  
 बी० हरिनिरित तिहि जवहार । जमेन नवन उमपाव ॥ १० ॥  
 अनुहास करि नहिं कवि । जामेन बाढि जमान ॥

- बी०—देह विजान परम हवचार । मंदिर ते मंदिर बधि चार ।  
 करत बबर भा कीन विहासा । छपट जपट ब्रह्म कोटि कराना ॥  
 तात मातु हा मुनिव पुकारा । बधि जवहार को जमहिं उवारा ॥  
 हम तु कहा कह कवि नहिं होई । जानरूप धरि नुर कोई ॥ १५ ॥  
 माधु जवजा कर सक ऐसा । नर बबर जनाच कर पैसा ॥

- जारा बबर निर्माय हक माहीं । हक विभीषन कर नृह माहीं ॥  
 ता कर दूत जमन बिहि बिरजा । सो न बरा तिहि कारन निरिजा ॥  
 उबटि पकटि जेका कवि जारी । बूझि परा पुनि बिंधु मैजारी ॥  
 बी०—पूछ पुछार कीर जम । धरि अनुकूल बहोरि ॥ २० ॥  
 जमकमुता जे जाने । ठाठ भयेन कर जोरि ॥

(Tirumala's translation of the above (with a few verbal alterations) is as follows. Ravana says:—

### Caupli

1. "The poor tailless wretch can then go back and fetch his master, and I shall have an opportunity of seeing his might, whom he has so extravagantly exalted."

The monkey smiled to himself to hear this. "Śārada, I know, will help me." Obedient to Rāvaṇa's command, the demons began making their foolish preparations.

5. Not a rag was left in the city nor a drop of ghee or oil, to such a length did he make his tail to grow, as he leaped about. Then they made sport of him. The citizens crowded to see the sight, and struck him with their feet and jeered him greatly. With beating of drums and clapping of hands they took him through the city and set fire to his tail. When Hanumān saw the fire blazing, he at once reduced himself to a very diminutive size, and slipping out of his bonds sprang on to the upper story of the gilded palace to the dismay of the giants' wives.

#### *Doha 25*

10. That instant the forty-nine winds whom Han had sent, began to blow: the monkey shouted with roars of laughter and swelled so big that he touched the sky.

\*     \*     \*     \*     \*

#### *Cūpaṇ*

(Of enormous stature and yet marvellous agility he leaped and went from palace to palace. As the city was thus set on fire, the people were at their wits' end, for the terrible flames burst forth in countless millions of places. "Alas! father and mother, hearken to our cry. Who is there now to save us?" 15. "As we said this is no monkey, but some god in monkey form. This is the result of not taking a good man's advice: our city is burnt as though it had no king." The city was consumed in an instant of time, save only Vibhishana's house: . . . the reason why it escaped Bhavān, was that he who sent the messenger had also created the fire. After the whole of Lankā had been turned upside down and given over to the flames, he threw himself into the middle of the sea."

20. After extinguishing his tail and recovering from his fatigue, he assumed his old diminutive form and went and stood before Janaki, with his hands clasped in prayer.

The corresponding Sanskrit version is as follows. It will be seen that it exactly agrees with Tulasi Dās's poem, each half-*dōha* generally agreeing with each half-*couplet* of the Hindi version :—

बाहूभेन विहीनो ऽथं यमिच्छति महाकपिः ।  
 चापेच्छति तदावच्छं स्वकीयं क्षान्तिमे व्रतः ॥  
 ममुत्वं तदा ब्रूयामो ऽपाचायेन यत् तदा ।  
 सुखेना वंमतिं तेषां विदुषां हृदि नास्तिः ॥  
 तर्कवानास चावाभि शारदापि विशारदा ।  
 श्रीरामकार्यकर्मिणि साहाय्यमकरोदिति ॥  
 चचास रावणकायान् चक्षाः सर्वे निष्ठाचराः ।  
 तामेव रचयामासु रचयामासुरज्जवा ॥  
 हनुमानकरोक्षीकाम् हृषयामास वाजधिम ।  
 वद्रेडनाय नो शिष्टं पुततेजाम्बरं पुरि ॥ ५ ॥  
 कीतुम् ब्रह्ममावाता राचवाः पुरवाधिनः ।  
 यदा कपिं ताडयित्वा ते हास्यं चर्त्तरे व्रज ॥  
 चाहस्य यववाग्दीर्घान् कृत्वा करतलध्वजान् ।  
 ददृजुः कपिपुच्छं ते विधास्य परितः पुरीम् ॥  
 पावकं ज्वलितं वीक्ष्य हनुमान् विह्वलेक्षर ।  
 ममुत्स्यं दधारासु राचवानां मवावहन् ॥  
 चतुर्लिकावाः शिखरे उमाकूटगतः शिखे ।  
 उतसुत हनुमान् वीरो राचकाकावनामताः ॥  
 पाता हवीनपञ्चाशद् ईश्वरपैरिता वपुः ।  
 तक्षिलमकरे चक्षाः वति चारा इव शिखे ॥ १० ॥  
 चतुर्हासं ततः कृत्वा नमस्कृत्य कपिपुच्छरः ।  
 वर्धयित्वा वपुः सीधम् आकाशकारिं पाकरोत् ॥

विद्याकायि वपुर्वपुत्री भरदाय वपुर्मतः ।  
 मन्दिराकायिदं विप्रम् चारीहति मतः कपिः ।  
 आकाशं विकराकाशं कोटिभिः परितो वृत्तम् ।  
 विभीषणं जङ्घां रक्षाधि मङ्गलीं दुर्दशामिताः ।  
 हा मातङ्गं यितङ्गं हा धातरम् महापदि ।  
 चाचल को ऽपि चाचल प्रसवो ऽयं समागतः ।  
 प्रमेष रावणं सर्वं वचनमूलं चक्षुः ।  
 वेषेण वानरः को ऽपि सुरो ऽयं मेव वानरः । १५ ।  
 तद्दशार्धं वचः कालं स्त्रीचकार न रावणः ।  
 चक्षुःकायाः सतामेतत् कथं प्रेक्षयतां मतम् ।  
 चनाचक्षीय ममरीं जङ्घां हृदि वानरः ।

• • • • •  
 दग्धा विमेषमाधि ऽयं जङ्घां वाम्बुनदाजया ।  
 जते विभीषणमारम चलाचक्ष्यमवूहिदम् ।

• • • • •  
 विभीषणो ऽपि श्रीराम- मत्त इत्यवधारय ।  
 हेतुना तेन नो दग्धं विभीषणमुहं वृभम् ।  
 कनकुलकममार्ज्यं जङ्घां दग्धा कपीचरः ।  
 पुनर्मध्ये समुद्रं न वृभुमान् व्यपतद्वक्षी ।  
 निर्वाणं पुच्छमाकाशं हित्वा कृत्वा वपुर्वपु ।  
 हृत्वीं संधीय्य प्राणव्याः संमुखे चाग्रवोहिदम् ।

The editors base their belief that Tulasi Dasa translated from a Sanskrit original on the following lines of the *Rama-carita-manasa*, in which the poet says that he learnt the story as a boy, but could not at first understand it. He then, for his own satisfaction, put it into verse in his vernacular

<sup>1</sup> It is hardly necessary to point out that this is altogether different from the account in the *Padma-Ramayan*, V, l. 14, f.

श्री०—संस्तु श्रीमद् बह्म चरितं बोद्धव्यम् । यस्मिन्निष्ठाया चरितेनार्हं भुवावी॥  
 सोऽहं शिवं तव भुवुडिदि दीप्ताः । राम भक्त चरितकारी श्रीमद् ॥  
 तेहि तव चाक्षयकर्म पुनि पावा । तिम्र पुनि भरद्वाज प्रति पावा ॥

श्री०—अं पुनि विषयं तव तव मुनी कथा को ब्रूयते ।  
 वमुद्धी गहिं तवि वाचयन तव चरितं रत्नो चयेत ॥ ३० ॥

श्री०—तदपि कही तव वारहि वारा । वमुद्धि परी कहु मनि चमुवारा ॥  
 भावा वन्द करव अं कीर । मोरे मन प्रबोध केहि कीर ॥

### Caupri

This pleasing story was (first of all) composed by Sambhu (i.e. Siva), and graciously told to Umā. The same (story) was given by Siva to Kāka-Bhūsundi, known to be chief among the votaries of Rāma. From him Yājñavalkya received it, and he recited it to Bharadvāja.

### Ikha 30

I again heard the tale from my own *guru* at Sukarkhet, but could not understand it, as I was quite a child and had no sense.

### Caupri

But my *guru* repeated it time after time, till at length I understood as much as my intellect would permit; and now I shall put it down in *bhūṣa* verses, so that my own mind may be awakened (to its full truth).

To this the editors add the following Sanskrit verses, which do not occur in any edition of Tulsi Dās's work with which I am acquainted. It will be seen that, with one important variation, it is a sort of abstract of the last few lines.

चातुर्थं मनुष्या कृतं भुवनिना श्रीमद्भुवा दुर्बलम् ।  
 श्रीमद्भुवाकृतं चरितं श्रीमद्भुवा श्रीमद्भुवा ॥

ममा तद्भुवाचमामिरतं साककमःप्राकये ।

भाषावचमिद् चकार मुकवीहावकचा मानकम् ॥

According to this a poet called *Sambhu*—not the god *Sambhu-Siva*—was the original author of the poem, which Tulasi Dasa translated into the vernacular for his own edification.

The editors do not say whence they got this Sanskrit verse. It can hardly be from the Sanskrit manuscript which they have discovered, for if that were the case the mention of Tulasi Dasa as the translator of the original poem would at once show that that cannot be the version contained in the present MS. The writer of an original poem could never say, in that poem, that it *had been* translated by anyone else. The most that he could do would be to indulge in prophecy, and to say that it *should be* translated. I presume, therefore, that the Sanskrit verses quoted are some floating tradition carried in the memory of pundits and of no known authorship. Possibly they may occur as a *katpaka* or apocryphal addition, in some MSS. of Tulasi Dasa's work. At any rate this verse does say that there was a Sanskrit *Ramayana* by a poet called *Sambhu*. The statement may be a mere tradition and there is, so far absolutely no test as to its truth or falsity.

Pending further information there is at present little doubt in my mind but that the Sanskrit version is a translation from the Hindi. A half-*couplet* contains at most only sixteen mātrās or instants while a half-*shloka* contains sixteen akṣaras, possibly equivalent, in counting to thirty instants. The *couplet* is therefore much shorter than a *shloka*, and to make them agree line for line it is necessary that the latter should contain more words than the former. If Tulasi Dasa translated from the Sanskrit he would have every now and then to leave out some important word. I can find no trace of this. If, on the other hand, *Sambhu*

translated from Tulasi Dāsa he would have to eke out his metre by the insertion of otiose epithets, just as we used to do with the help of a *gradus* when writing Latin verses at school. There are numerous traces of this in the Sanskrit version. In the third *śloka*, *vidāruḍa* and the whole of the following *pada* are superfluous. So the third *pada* of the ninth *śloka*. The tenth and eleventh *ślokas* are a very clumsy version of the neat *dōha* of Tulasi Dāsa (ll. 10 and 11). In his fourteenth *śloka* he makes the frightened children cry not only for their parents but for a brother, thereby leaving us to assume that each child had only one brother. The two last *padas* hardly represent the words of Tulasi Dāsa, "who is there now to save us?" In the sixteenth, the *pada*, "*śricaktra na śtramah*" is unnecessary surplusage. Similarly, the seventeenth *śloka* is an evident expansion of the corresponding line of Tulasi Dāsa. Very instructive is the fourth *śloka*, where Tulasi Dāsa's alliteration of *racana* and *racana* is spelt in the Sanskrit *racanamān racayamānuh*.

For these reasons, I do not think that, so far as present materials are available, there is any proof that Tulasi Dāsa translated his *Rama-carita-mānasa* from this so-called *Sambhu Ramayana*. If, however, he did this, it cannot diminish our admiration for a translation more beautiful than the original, or make us forget that he was also the author of the *Gita Ramayana*, the *Kavitta Ramayana* the *Vaṇayā Patṭrika*, and other fine works.

G. A. G.

#### ON THE PHONETICS OF THE WARDAK VASE

The inscription on this vase, of which an account is given by Mr. Pargiter on pp. 1060 ff. of the JRAS. for 1912, is in the Kharoṣṭhi character, and belongs, like nearly all other writings in that character, to the extreme north-west of India, i.e. to the locality in which the languages which I call "*Modern Pāṭhā*" are now spoken.



It is a well-known fact that in the Kharoṣṭhi character consonants which are doubled in Sanskrit or Pāli are written as single letters. It has hitherto been customary to treat this fact as an instance of a defective alphabet, and, in editing inscriptions in this character, to assume that the double letters should be restored. Thus in the case of this vase-inscription Mr. Pargiter restores *gudigrena* to *guddikena*, *bhrudaha* to *bhratadha*, *pariyata* to *pariyatta*, and so on.

I would suggest that a consideration of the modern vernaculars of the north-west will show that the assumption that this restoration is required is probably wrong, and that the dialect in which these Kharoṣṭhi inscriptions are written pronounced these consonants as single, not as double, letters.

Of the modern Indian vernaculars, Panjābī and Lahnda (which, though a member of the north-western group is strongly influenced by Panjābī) adhere most closely to the old forms. We have such words as *pāc* 'high', *maḍ*, a sound, *duddh*, milk, *cam* 'leather', and many others which have retained the Pāli and Prakrit double consonants unchanged.

In languages further to the east it is usual to simplify the double consonant substituting a single one in its place and at the same time to lengthen and sometimes nasalize the preceding vowel in compensation. Thus for example Hindi has *dehā*, not *dēdh*, and *cām*.

On the other hand, the north-western languages prefer to simplify the double consonant without lengthening the preceding vowel. This is most marked in Sindhi and the Modern Pīṣāca languages, which have *ma* (S; *maḍa* (Ksh.); *duddh\** (S), *dēd* (Ksh.), and *cam\** (S; *cām* (Ksh.). The same peculiarity is sometimes noticeable in Lahnda, as in *duddh*, compared with the Panjābī *duddh*, although, as has been stated, in Lahnda the double consonants are generally retained.

**The following table illustrates this rule more fully :—**

[illegible]

The main languages of the north west were spoken in the same locality as that in which the dialect or dialects recorded in Kharosthi were spoken. As the former are peculiar in refusing to employ double consonants, it is reasonable to assume that double consonants were not pronounced in the Pali of the north-west, and that Kharosthi inscriptions, so far from being imperfect representations of pronunciation, were in this respect phonetically accurate.

It must be remembered that we have no other inscriptions in any other character to authorize us to "restore" the double letters in these dialects.

G. A. G.

CAMBRIDGE.

October 22, 1912.

---

### ALOPEN AND SILADITYA

Professor Takakusu (*I-tsing*, p. xxviii, n. 8) states that Alopen, the Nestorian missionary to China, visited Śīlāditya, in India, in the year 639 A.D. This statement is based on a remark of Edkins, quoted in the *Athenæum* of July 3, 1880, p. 8. Back numbers of the *Athenæum* are not readily available, and more than one writer has accepted Takakusu's account, without testing it, as an important contribution to the history of Christianity in India. I myself did this in the article *Bhakti-mārga*, in Hastings' *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. ii p. 548.

Since then the statement has been called in question, and I have been able to trace it to its source. I now hasten to correct any wrong impression which may have been caused by my trust in Takakusu. He is quite wrong, and has entirely misunderstood Edkins. In the passage referred to, Edkins is not dealing with Śīlāditya but with the Emperor of China.

GEORGE A. GRIERSON

CAMBRIDGE.

November 28, 1912.

---

### KANAMOKSA. A QUERY

The Kāshmiri word *ampa* means "feeding beak to beak", as a bird feeds its young ones. Kāshmiri Pandits invariably translate it by the Sanskrit word *kāṇamokṣa*. For instance, the following passage in a well-known folktale in Sir Aurel Stein's collection runs as follows:—  
*ami chunakh dyut"mot" ampa-kani kond", she (the bird step-mother) has fed them (her two step-children) beak to*

beak with a thorn (instead of food), or, as translated by that excellent scholar, the late Pundit Gōvind Kaul anayā ca 'nayaḥ kṛṇamokṣatrayatyayena kuntakō dattō 'sti.

In another connexion he thus defines the word *ampa* *Pakṣiṇām bhuktih, kṛṇamokṣah. Kṛṇamokṣapadaśyaṇ* 'ed 'rtho 'trī spṛśah. *Purāṇ-tu kṛṇamokṣapadam aprasiddham ivā 'sti, ato 'trī 'nyaiḥ padair arthah pārto 'sti. Kṛṇamokṣapadam tu mārkandēyapurāṇe labhyate* Here we learn that *kṛṇamokṣa* is a rare word but that it occurs in the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa.

I have not come across the word in that Purāṇa, though I have searched for it. Nor does the word occur in any dictionary or *kośa* on which I can lay my hand. Can any reader of this kindly give me a reference to the passage in which it occurs in the Purāṇa? Does it occur anywhere else?

G. A. GRIERSON

CAMBRIDGE

November 28, 1912

## THE ORIGIN OF THE KRṢṆA CULT

The question of the sources of the Kṛṣṇa cult is one in regard to which it is probably impossible to come to any confident conclusion, but it is a question of great interest to students of religious origins. The long history of this worship in India the tenacity of its grasp upon the Hindu spirit, the intense devotion that at its highest it has awakened in its votaries—these things arouse curiosity in regard to this deity more perhaps than in regard to any other member of the Hindu pantheon. To determine the original characteristics of the god and of his worship may not go far to explain his influence, but it will perhaps indicate from what soil of thought and feeling some of the deepest roots of human desire and aspiration spring. It will perhaps give some hint of the sources within the Hindu heart of that "bhakti"

or loving devotion which has clung so fondly about this god and which possesses some elements of a pure ethical theism.

It has been recently claimed that Kṛṣṇa belonged originally to the class of what are called "vegetation deities". Investigation of primitive religious beliefs seems to demonstrate that the fact of the renewal of the world in spring, the annual quickening of nature to new life, formed a powerful motive in creating in men a spirit of worship and of grateful reverence. Perhaps the formula of the vegetation cult has been too frequently resorted to as is always the danger with a new theory, but there can be little doubt that many of the most influential and most emotionally effective cults of ancient times centred around this mystery of life born again from the dead. Such were the worships of Osiris, of Dionysus, of Attis and Adonis, of the Babylonian Ishtar, and there is a body of evidence unconvincing, perhaps in detail, but strong in its cumulative effect, which includes Kṛṣṇa within this category.

1. In the first place it is recognized that the vegetation spirit is frequently represented as assuming animal form so that the god may have been originally an animal or may be closely associated with an animal. It is most commonly with cattle that primitive thought connects the spirit of the fields, and in consequence we find that there were, for example, "Dionysus the Bull" and Isis the cow. By a natural transition the god who is sometimes incarnated in an animal becomes the guardian of the herds. Now, the association of Kṛṣṇa with cattle is one of the most deeply rooted characteristics of the god. The name Govind or Gopendra, chief of cow herds, is found in the *Mahābhārata*, and probably as early as the *Mahābhārata*, which brings it to the second century B.C. or earlier (A. B. Keith in JRAS., January, 1908). In this connexion it may be of some significance that Kṛṣṇa is

said to have on his breast a curl of hair which is named *Śrī-vataṣ* (the calf). It is possible that this points back to a time when the god was himself or was represented by a bull or ox. Similarly it is believed that the epithet commonly translated "ox-eyed", *Βούτις*, applied by Homer to Hera implies that she was originally a cow-faced goddess.

2. Further, there can be little doubt that Kṛṣṇa's brother Balarāṁ was a deity intimately associated with the harvest and the fruitfulness of the crops. He is a god of harvest revels and drunkenness, one of whose symbols is the plough, even as one of his brother's is the ox-goad. Both to him and to Kṛṣṇa is given the title *Dāmōdar*, "having a cord about the belly," a name that is explained as referring to the wheat sheaves, bound with wisps of straw.<sup>1</sup> Balarāṁ is connected especially with the wine of the harvest festival, and it is just possible that his epithets of "*Nīlāmbar*" and "*Sitivas*", which describe him as "clad in dark blue", as well as Kṛṣṇa's own colour, come from the stain of grape-juice. Bishop Heber was struck, when he saw the festival of Rāma and Sita, with the likeness that Hanuman and his army with their bodies dyed with indigo bore to Pan and the Satyrs in a Dionysiac revel, smeared with wine juice.<sup>2</sup> Perhaps both groups of observances have their root in the revels that accompanied the return of spring and the joy of harvest.

3. A third group of considerations that seem to connect Kṛṣṇa with the corn and the harvest relates to the vegetarian sacrifices that so largely displaced in some regions of Indian worship the older sacrifices of blood. Whether this was a reform introduced by the *bhakti* cults cannot be determined, but there are at least

<sup>1</sup> JRAS, October, 1907, p. 902. Cf. the cord of the undoubted vegetation deity, Gula of Babylonia (Farnell's *Greece and Babylon*, p. 266, n.).

<sup>2</sup> Heber's *Journal*, I, pp. 448, 449.

indications that this may have been the case. It does not seem probable that this change was due to feelings of humanity. The place that the doctrine of *ahimsa* or non-injury has in the Jain and Buddhist systems does not preclude the view that it may in its origin have been associated with such a worship as that of Kṛṣṇa, for it may be accepted as proved that large elements from this worship entered into these faiths at their inception. There is an indication too from the attitude of Yājñavalkya in the *Śatapata Brāhmaṇa* (iii, i, 2, 21) that the orthodox tradition which he represented did not recognize vegetarianism as an absolutely authoritative rule. Again we find in the *Mahabharata* (iii, 138), that it is the Rsis, "wholly devoted to Nārāyaṇ," who maintain in opposition to the gods that sacrifices of grain and not goats should be offered. If then, there is a possibility that bloodless sacrifices (and the doctrine of non-injury which probably followed) originated with the worshippers of Kṛṣṇa have we any hint as to the direction from which it may have come? If it be the case that this was originally a vegetation cult we may find the origin of the sacrifice of a 'barley cow' in a practice described by M. Reinach: "Harvesters took the last animal that had found shelter among the last sheaves, or *fashioned a simulacrum of such an animal with straw* killed it burned it and scattered the ashes with the idea that the spirit of harvest thus preserved from the decay of winter would remain in the fields as a fertilizing force" (*Origines*, p. 80). Of this practice there are many instances in all parts of the world, and it is easy to see how from it might develop the view of the superiority of grain sacrifices to sacrifices of blood. Sometimes the offering is a simulacrum of an animal representing the corn-spirit, sometimes it is one of the corn-spirit himself. In connexion with the worship of Kṛṣṇa there is a curious and probably ancient survival among the Ahirs, which is confirmatory

of the view here suggested. "They have a special feast, known as the Govardhana-puja, which takes its name from the holy Mathura hill associated with the cult of Kṛṣṇa, at which they pray to a heap of boiled rice which is supposed to represent the hill. In other parts the worship is paid to a mass of cow-dung made to represent a human form, probably that of Kṛṣṇa" (*Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, i. p. 232).

4. But perhaps the most conclusive evidence in support of the explanation of the Kṛṣṇa cult as originally that of a vegetation spirit rests upon a passage in the *Mahābhāṣya*. There we are told of a play called the *Kaṁṣavadha*, in which Kṛṣṇa and his followers, whose faces are reddened (*raktamukha*), contend with and slay Kāṁsa, who with his followers has his face coloured black. This, it can hardly be doubted, was a "vegetation masque", a play in which the struggle of the spring with the winter is represented and sympathetically aided. There is a remarkable parallel to this in a Greek legend to which Dr. Farnell traces the origin of the Greek tragic drama. There the contest is between Xanthos (white) and Melanthes (black), and the latter with the aid of Dionysus Melanagis (of the black goat-skin) kills Xanthos. Evidently this was a winter play, and hence its sorrowful character and its probable connexion with tragic drama. Kṛṣṇa worship, on the other hand, was joyful in its character, as is natural if he was associated rather with the victory of spring over winter than with the triumph of the winter darkness. The one difficulty here is the fact that the representative of the new life of the spring in the Indian play is Kṛṣṇa, the black. Dionysus of the black goat-skin and Melanthes evidently in the Greek version represent rather the winter divinity. (See A. B. Keith in *JRAS.*, April, 1912, pp. 411 ff.; Farnell, *Cults*, v, pp. 230 ff.)

5. We may in this connexion note the close parallel between Dionysus, undoubtedly a vegetation deity, and



**Kṛṣṇa.** Even in the Xanthos-Melanthos story Dionysus, who by his deceit wins the victory for Melanthos, reminds in this aspect of his character of the Kṛṣṇa of the *Mahabharata*. We may not be able to go as far as to suggest that the two were originally identical, or that the Thracian deity not only invaded Greece but also, as the Greek tradition affirmed, India but at the same time we can see that they resemble each other so closely in many of their characteristics that we cannot doubt that they belong to the same class of cults. It will be remembered that Megasthenes speaks of Dionysus and Herakles as Indian gods. It has hitherto been taken for granted that he applied these names to Śiva and Kṛṣṇa respectively. There is, however, a strong case for reversing the identification. On the face of it Herakles with his club resembles Śiva more than Kṛṣṇa while the Greek reporter speaks of 'the dread that the Indians conceived' for the god whom he so describes. On the other hand if Dionysus 'taught the Indians to yoke oxen use the vine, sow corn', that description seems certainly to fit Kṛṣṇa rather than the rival deity.

There are other details in the Greek description which help to make out on the whole a strong case for the identification of Dionysus with Kṛṣṇa rather than with Śiva. Further if Kṛṣṇa and Dionysus were closely allied in character and origin, this fact will explain the Bacchic strain in Buddhist art and literature for there is little doubt that Buddhism took over large elements from the popular Kṛṣṇa worship. It will be remembered that "Boudyas" in the Greek account is one of the descendants of Dionysus. It is perhaps also worth noting that the epithet of Kṛṣṇa, Madhusudana, generally translated "destroyer of the demon Madhu", may not impossibly really describe him as "premier of the intoxicating honey-head".

There are other considerations

strengthening this view of the derivation of the Kṛṣṇa cult. There is, for example, the connexion of the god with the sun, which we find in the *dehagatra*, or swing festival- a connexion which is natural in the case of a vegetation deity. To this connexion may also be due the epithet *Hṛṣikeśa*, "of the bristling hair," an epithet appropriate to a god closely associated with the sun and its rays, just as in the case of Samson a solar origin has been claimed for his story on account of his long hair. Further, we note that, as is appropriate for a deity who represents spring victorious over winter, Kṛṣṇa, like other vegetation gods, is said to have made a descent into the nether world. The cumulative effect of all these considerations is overwhelming as evidence at least that large elements of an ancient vegetation cult have gone to the making of the Kṛṣṇa legend and to the moulding of the character of his worship.

N. MACNICOL.

#### A COPPERPLATE DISCOVERED AT KASIA, AND BUDDHA'S DEATH-PLACE

A copperplate was discovered by Dr. Vogel in excavating the large stūpa behind the Nirvāṇa temple at Kasiā in 1911, and was seen to bear an inscription, of which the first line was incised, but all the rest appeared, though almost entirely covered with verdigris, to be in ink. It was sent to Dr. Hoernle for examination,<sup>1</sup> and he requested me to undertake the duty.

By careful cleaning the whole of the inscription has been made visible, except where corrosion had destroyed it altogether. The full account of it will be published in the Archaeological Survey Report dealing with the excavations at Kasiā, but meanwhile, with Mr. Marshall's approval, a short note about it may be of interest to scholars and historians.

<sup>1</sup> See *JRAS.*, 1912, pp. 123-5.

The characters are a form of the Northern Gupta script and the language is Sanskrit. The inscription consists of the *Nidāna-sūtra* (the *Paṭicca-samuppāda*) followed by a dedication. The plate bears no date, but may, from the coins of Kumāragupta (son and successor of Candragupta II) found with it, be assigned to the third quarter of the fifth century A.D. The donor was a bhikṣu Dharmananda, son of Haribala, who is styled [*vihāra* ?]-*śrāmin*, and who is almost certainly the *mahā-vihāra-śrāmin* Haribala, donor of the colossal stone statue of Buddha recumbent, discovered at Kasia in 1875-7, which Dr. Fleet has assigned to about the end of the fifth century A.D.<sup>1</sup>

At the end of the dedication occur the words—

... *rvāṇa-caitye tāmra-paṭṭa iti.*

The first three letters are obliterated, but the third of them must without doubt have been *nī*, and the two preceding can hardly have been anything but *pari*. This copperplate therefore declares that it was deposited in the (Pari)nirvāṇa-caitya, and thus testifies that the stūpa in which it was found was called by that name and that this spot was believed to be the place of Buddha's death in the fifth century A.D. From the bald way in which this statement is added at the end of the inscription it would seem that the belief was firmly established then, so that the plate virtually proves that tradition had declared even earlier than that, that Buddha died at Kasia and that Kasia is Kuśinagara.

An interesting fact revealed by this plate is the way in which copperplates were inscribed. The matter was first written out in ink on the plate, and when the ink dried the engraver cut the written letters into the metal. If he were skilled or careful, the incision would be good; if he were inexperienced, he would probably bungle the incision; and if he happened to blur or rub out part of

<sup>1</sup> Fleet's *GI.*, p. 272.

a letter through carelessness, he would make a mistake. Here the engraver was manifestly incapable, for only the first line has been carved and most of the letters in it are bungled. There can be little doubt that, as his work was so unsatisfactory, the incision of the rest was given up and the plate was accepted as it was, written only in ink.

F. E. PARGITER.

### THE ANGULA OF SIX YAVAS

In this Journal for 1912, p. 470, Dr. Fleet has asked for any information about the *angula* of six *yavas* and the *yōjana* which was based on it by the author of the Second Ārya-Siddhānta. I cannot say anything about such a *yōjana*. But, in translating the *Rāgavibodha*, a work on Hindū music, for inclusion in a Journal of Oriental Music published here in Mysore, I found a quotation in it from Śārṅgadēva's *Saṅgitaratnākara*,—another work on music, belonging to the first half of the thirteenth century,—which has led to my collecting the following passages from chapter 6 of the *Saṅgitaratnākara*, as edited in the Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series (Poona, 1897), mentioning various *angulas*, including one of six *yavas*, used in determining the sizes of *Vīṇās* or lutes. An *angula* is a 'finger-breadth': a *yava* or *yavodara* is a 'barley-corn'.

#### I.—VERSE 277

तिर्यग्बोद्धः पद्मिर्भिर्बुधैः सादिहाकमुच्यते ।  
बृहतीदक्षनाभं सादिर्धौ पञ्चाशदकमुच्यते ॥

#### II.—VERSE 467

प्राक्पञ्चदशयवाभिर्बुधैः पञ्चयवं अनुः ।  
पञ्चदशयवाभिर्बुधैः पञ्चयवं सिद्धम् ॥

## III.—VERSES 509, 510

माने पञ्चवर्षे कलादुक्ततेऽथ चर्षीऽधिकः ।  
 सप्ताङ्गुलादिवर्षेण चर्षं चोर्ध्वं चतुर्दशतः ।  
 पूर्वमानाधिकाः सन्ति ते सप्ताष्टमवा चवाः ।  
 सार्धपञ्चवर्षे माने चका सादृशवर्जितम् ।

## IV.—VERSES 526, 527

चङ्गुलं निववन्वाची विष्टं नक्षितशास्त्रतः ।  
 न सङ्गुलं पञ्चवर्षं दृक्ते शास्त्रलोकयोः ।  
 चङ्गुलं निक्षुषिः सङ्गिभक्षिर्वग्निः सावयोदरेः ।  
 दक्षिण्य चरक साप्ताभिमाने सन्निधिका ।

## V.—VERSES 562, 563

शाङ्गुदेवोऽन्वमानेन पञ्चवर्षं चङ्गुपयत ।  
 तिर्यग्वयोदरेः सार्धचतुर्भिर्निक्षुषेरिह ।  
 चङ्गुलं तेन पूर्वोत्तरीत्वारथिकवीरतः ।  
 सन्ति द्वाविंशतिर्वर्षविशेषास्तेषु चकादे ।

These passages may be translated as follows :—

I.—Here an *angula* is measured by six *yarodaras* free from husk and placed crosswise : the measure of the stick of the Brihati [a *Vinā*] is fifty *angulas* in length.

II.—Prior to the measure of the bamboo stick of the fourteenth variety (of *Vinās*), they say that an *angula* is equal to five *yavas* ; regarding the other varieties from the fourteenth and upwards, they say that an *angula* is equal to five and a half *yavas*.

III.—If five *yavas* be the measure (of an *angula*), then why is there seen an excess of a *yava* here, in the *Vinā*-sticks measuring seven *angulas* and upwards ? how can it also hold good (in the *Vinā*-sticks) after the fourteenth variety ? Exceeding the above measure, there are (*angulas* of) seven, eight, and nine *yavas* : if the measure (of an *angula*) be five and a half *yavas*, then the example [i.e. the length of a *Vinā*] will be unsettled.

IV.—He [i.e. the author, Śārngadēva] has definitely fixed the measure of an *aṅgula* as settled in the science of arithmetic: no *aṅgula* of five *yavas* is seen either in the Śāstras or in popular use. An *aṅgula* is made by six *yavōdanas* free from husk and placed crosswise: in the measure of the *khāni* [the hollow stick of the *Vinā*] the little finger of the right hand (*is used*).

V.—Śārngadēva has described the form of a *Vinā*-stick on another measure: by four and a half *yavōdanas* free from husk and placed crosswise (*is made*) an *aṅgula* here: in accordance with this measure there are, as described before, twenty-two varieties of *Vinā*-sticks, commencing with the *Ēkavīra* [the name of the first]: about these we are going to speak.

R. SHAMASANTRY.

### THE VRĀTYAS

In a recent contribution to the *Vienna Oriental Journal*<sup>1</sup> Paul Charpentier has endeavoured to establish a new account of the *Vrātyas* of the Vedic tradition. He finds in them the founders of the widespread Rudra-Śiva cult, and the spiritual ancestors of the later and modern Śivaïtes. The *Vrātyastomas* of the ritual were performances to mark the admission within the Brahmin circle of such *Vrātyas*, whose addiction to the cult of Śiva in his dread forms rendered them an object of suspicion to their more orthodox fellows. Further, the *Vrātya* of the *Atharvaveda*, book xv. is no other than Rudra-Śiva himself and simultaneously his earthly counterpart, the Śivaïte ascetic.

The theory is attractive and interesting: it remains to consider how far it can claim to be more than a speculation or to have real value. In the first place the argument from the later literature can be disregarded: its point is

<sup>1</sup> xxv, 255-62. Cf. xlii, 151 seqq.

that Manu<sup>1</sup> derives from a Rājanya Vratya the Licchavis and Mallas of Buddhist fame; now these families cannot have been derived from the despised mixed castes, but for the fact that they practised an unbrahminic religion, that of Rudra-Śiva, and it is stated that they never appear in the Buddhist texts as practising Brahminical offerings. This suggestion can clearly be of no value for early Vedic times or throw light on the early character of the Vratya, and it is therefore needless to consider what validity it has for later days.

Secondly, it is argued that in the *Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa*<sup>2</sup> the Vratyas are described as those left behind when the gods went to the world of heaven. In the *Śatapatha*<sup>3</sup> the gods go to the sky and Rudra is left behind. It is deduced that the Vratyas must be connected with Śiva. The argument is wholly without value, as the passages stand in no conceivable relation and any theory could be supported if such evidence were allowed to stand good. yet the leader of those left behind in the *Pañcaviṃśa* is expressly given as Dyutāna Māruta, not Śiva at all.

Thirdly, it is argued that the Gṛhapati of the Vratyas in their offerings is Śiva himself because his apparatus is similar to that of Śiva. The apparatus includes a turban (*tiryannuaddha*), a goad (*pratoda*), a particular kind of bow (*jyāhroda*, explained by Kātyāyana<sup>4</sup> as an *ayogyan dhanuḥ* and by Lāṭyāyana<sup>5</sup> as a *dhanuska om-s*), a black garment (*kṛṇakṇa vāśak*), a rough wagon planked over, drawn by a horse and an ass, a silver ornament (*niṣka*), two sheepskins fastened at the sides and *kṛṇabulakṣe*. Now Rudra-Śiva has the turban he carries a bow, and in the *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa*<sup>6</sup> is referred to as *kṛṇakṇa*, and in one passage in the *Rigveda*<sup>7</sup> he has a *niṣkaṇ yajātāṇa vīśvavṛpam* and *yajita* and

<sup>1</sup> x, 22.<sup>2</sup> xvi, 1 1.<sup>3</sup> i, 7, 2 1<sup>4</sup> *Śrauta Sūtra*, xii, 4, 11.<sup>5</sup> *Śrauta Sūtra*, vii, 4, 8.<sup>6</sup> v, 14. See Roth, ZDMG. xi, 244.<sup>7</sup> ii, 28, 11.

*vājata* "stehen einander jedenfalls sehr nahe". Thus attired Rudra-Śiva is accepted by the offering into the regular circle of the gods, and the followers of the Grhapati also abandon their older faith by the rite, but at the same time represent the uncanny, ghostly comrades of Rudra-Śiva. The whole ceremony is comparable in its dramatic character to the performances at the Soma buying or the Mahāvratā.

But all this is without sure ground. The greater part of the Grhapati's attire and accompaniments has no parallel in Rudra at all: where are the wagon, the sheepskins, the goud? The turban is there, but not *tiryannaddha*, and it is the mode, not the common turban, that matters. The bow is there, but not the *jyāhrodā*, and it is the bow of a peculiar kind that is the point. Nor will *yajata* transform itself into *vājata* to please us. It is only open to fall back on the *kṛṣṇāṅga vāṁsa*, but let it be remembered that black is a common colour regularly associated with the uncanny and dread. There is, in fact, wholly lacking the exact correspondence in detail which is essential for any proof of the identity of the Grhapati and Rudra-Śiva. The obvious explanation of the whole of the outfit is that it is the description of a local form of dress worn by the Vratyas known to the texts. indeed, Lātāyana<sup>1</sup> expressly tells us that the *vipatha* is a *prācyaṛatha*, "a chariot of the easterners" and the rite ends with the bestowal of the apparatus to a *Mayadhadeśīya*<sup>2</sup> *brahma-bandhu*, an easterner. In the face of this obvious explanation, that of Charpentier is clearly invalid.

Nor does it win any real support from the effort to confirm it by *Atharvareṇa*, xv. That this section deals with the Vratya is shown beyond doubt by the references to the turban, the goud, the *vipatha*, and the *Māgadha*. But I find nothing in it to show that the Vratya is

<sup>1</sup> *Śrauta Sūtra*, viii, 6. 9.

<sup>2</sup> *Lātāyana*, xxi, 4. 22; *Lātāyana*, viii, 6. 26.



Rudra-Śiva. The piece is a late one, in Brāhmaṇa style, and it celebrates in the highest way the Vrātya, but such theological speculations are peculiarly common in the *Atharvaveda*, and render it needless to suppose that behind the Vrātya lies the figure of a great god. Charpentier<sup>1</sup> sees proof of this in xv, 1, 4-8, but all that is there said is that the Vrātya became Mahādeva and Iāna, while in xv, 5, 1 seq., Bhava, Śarva, Paśupati, Ugradeva, Iāna, Rudra, are his servants, all signs of his cosmic potency, not proofs of his original nature. Nor can any weight be assigned to the conjecture<sup>2</sup> that the Vrātya is depicted as healing Prajāpati from the wound inflicted on him by Rudra for his incest with his daughter. The facts are all adequately accounted for on Bloomfield's<sup>3</sup> hypothesis that the Vrātya is celebrated as Brāhman under Śivaite influence.

But not only is there a complete lack of serious evidence for the theory, it makes no attempt to deal with the fundamental difficulties with which it is confronted. In the first place no explanation is offered of the peculiar nature of the rite in which the god is supposed himself to be received into the order of the orthodox gods. That such a rite is conceivable is no doubt the case for in religion denials of possibility are hardly ever wise. But there is no trace of any such rite in the Vedic religion and *a priori* it is not a very probable one. Secondly - and this is still more serious - it assumes that to the Hindus of the Brāhmaṇa period Rudra-Śiva was a strange god, and one outside the usual circle of the pantheon. But nothing can be further from the truth, the *Śatamudriya* of all the Yajurveda Samhitās is clear proof of his full acceptance in all his aspects by those to whom the period owes its religious tendencies, and as Aufrecht<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> VQJ. xiv, 374.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid* 376, n. 2.

<sup>3</sup> *Atharvaveda*, p. 94.

<sup>4</sup> See his *Astaveya Brāhmaṇa*, pp. vi, vii.

long ago pointed out, it is Rudra-Śiva who is the great god of such texts as the *Ātārva* and the *Kaustubhī Brāhmaṇa*. We may, having regard to the Rgvedic Rudra, believe that the Rudra of the Brāhmaṇas is a god with characteristics borrowed from aboriginal tribes, but we cannot believe that to the composers of the Brāhmaṇas he was a god not wholly received into the circle of the gods. We must not confound the fact that a god is a dreadful god in some aspects with the view that he is a strange god. Thirdly, the theory of Charpentier completely fails to explain the characteristics of the Vrāṭyas as they appear in the *Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa*.<sup>1</sup> We are there told that they do not practise *kṛṣi* or trade, i.e. that they are distinct in culture from the Brahminical Indians who practise in the times of the Brāhmaṇas both. Moreover, they have a different code of law, for that is the real meaning of *adandyaṃ dandena ghnantaḥ caranti*,<sup>2</sup> and they have a different speech, for they call what is easy to say difficult, a point indicating at the least a Prakrit speech in which conjunct consonants had been softened. They are described as speaking *dikṣitaracam* though *adikṣitaḥ*, but this characteristic is not really intelligible. Charpentier<sup>3</sup> thinks *dikṣitaracam* may be meant in sense, and that the sense is that, though Śūdras, they reckon their genealogies, comparing the *dikṣitaraca* of the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*,<sup>4</sup> but this theory is very doubtful, for *rac* is not *vāda*. But in any case why should worshippers of Rudra-Śiva have been ignorant of agriculture and trading, and have differed in speech from the ordinary Vedic Indians? There is no explanation possible unless we accept the view that Rudra-Śiva was a strange new god of extraneous origin to the Brāhmaṇa period, and this contradicts all the texts. On the other hand, the obvious view that the persons meant are

<sup>1</sup> xvii, 4. 2.<sup>2</sup> VOJ. xxy, 303.<sup>3</sup> xvii, 4. 9.<sup>4</sup> iii, 2. 1. 40; see Weber, *Id.* x. 83.

non-Brahminical tribes of a less advanced culture is open to no intelligible objection.

Of minor points three may be noted. Charpentier<sup>1</sup> suggests that the famous crux in the *Rgveda*<sup>2</sup> as to the sense of *naicāśikhā* may receive some light from the obscure *śikhaka* or *śiśhaka*, which are among the variants of the names of castes sprung from *Vrātyas* in *Manu*.<sup>3</sup> but the suggestion is clearly of no help or serious value, nor does *prāmāgandā* really suggest *Magadha* on any scientific principle. Secondly, Charpentier<sup>4</sup> repeatedly quotes the views of Dhānamjaya, but, though he has many predecessors in this practice, have we really anyone else but Dhānamjaya? Neither early Indian editions<sup>5</sup> nor MSS. can be really expected to distinguish *py* and *yy* in Devanāgarī. Nor is it fair to banish paragraphs 15-18 of *Atharvaveda*, xv, as a later addition: they are perfectly reasonable in a glorification of the *Vrātya*, even if they do not help to bear out the theory that the *Vrātya* is really Rudra-Siva.

To the authorities on the *Vrātyastomas* as used by Charpentier should be added the text of the *Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, which the energy of Caland has now made available.<sup>6</sup> It does not, however, add anything which, so far as I can judge, throws additional light on this obscure and curious rite.

A. BERRIEDALE KEITH.

### SOME BENGALI VERBS

I should premise that this note is not the result of learning or research. On the contrary, the only justification

<sup>1</sup> VOJ. xxv, 357, n. 5.

<sup>2</sup> iii, 52. 14. See Macdonell & Keith, *Vedic Index*, i, 459: ii, 38, 474.

<sup>3</sup> x, 21. The text is wholly uncertain, the commentators having different readings.

<sup>4</sup> VOJ. xxv, 306-8.

<sup>5</sup> Viz. that of Lāṭipān.

<sup>6</sup> xviii, 24-6; *Über das rituelle Sūtra des Baudhāyana*, p. 21.

for printing, it is the hope that comparative students of language may solve a problem which seems to have escaped notice in Bengali grammars.

In Mr P. James' little grammar is the statement that the *causal* is formed by adding *a* to the root thus from *ar* do causal *ara*. So in Wengert's grammar it is written that the *causal* verb-noun (in *a*) is formed from the simple one by inserting *a* before the last letter, as *de* *dehan* see *dehan* cause to see show.

N. d. a. this *a* is the survival of the Prakrit *e* and the Sanskrit *aya*. But the statements in the grammars seem to imply that this linguistic device is confined to expressing the *causative* sense. It is very commonly used (1) to construct denominative verbs (2) as an alternative to the simple form to express the ordinary meaning of the verb (3) to express a middle or passive sense.

(1) The denominative verbs are numerous, though not many of them are commonly used in literature nowadays, when it is a usual device to use a Sanskrit verbal noun with the verb "to do" or "to make". I give a list of some of the commonest or most interesting:—

*palan* or *palāyan*, to flee, escape (*para* + *aya* + *an*).

*lalan*, to grow like a *lata*, or creeper.

*amcan*, to perform *ācamana*, washing out the mouth.

*apalan*, to hinder, from *arjula*.

*agan*, to form a thought (*ut-jān-aya* ')

*kamadan*, to bite (of a dog etc.)—*√mad*?

*komeca* to plead from *komeā*, plead of *dhota*.

*ghadan*, to nod assent, from *ghad*, neck, nape.

*caparān* to slap from *capar*, a slap.

*thangan*, to eudge- from *thangr*, a bludgeon.

*dhalan* to be lewd, to play the *dhala*.

*dhalan*, to throw a *dhala* or clod.

*dhakan*, to give a *dhaka* or push.

*palan*, to dawn, from *prabha*.

*bhāṇḍān*, to deceive, from *bhāṇḍa*, a cheat.

*māyān*, to practise magic or *māyā*.

*veḍān*, to walk about (*rihār*?).

*gūḍān*, to clasp (*gūḍ*?).

*hātārān*, to feel the way about, from *hat*, *hastā*.

(2) Verbs which occur in both forms, but with the same meaning:

*daṇḍān* or *daṇḍān*, to run (*dhāraṇ*).

*thakān* or *thakān*, to cheat.

*tikān* or *tikān*, to look, glance.

*huraṇ* or *hūrān*, to lose.

*phuraṇ* or *phūrān*, to be used up, exhausted.

*phāḍān* or *phāḍān*, to split.

*sāmtarān* or *sāmtarān*, to swim across.

*pālān* or *pālān*, to nourish.

*kulān* or *kulān*, to suffice.

*ceṁcān* or *ceṁcān*, to shriek, etc.

(3) Verbs which, in the causative form, have a middle or passive sense:—

*chaḍān*, to sprinkle; *chaḍān*, to be sprinkled, scattered.

*śukān*, to dry; *śukān*, to become dry.

*badlān*, to change; *badlān*, to become changed, etc.

It seems to me as if many of these so-called causative forms have a reflexive sense, e.g. *veḍān* = se promener, *pālān* = s'esquiver, etc. It is difficult to give proof of these shades of meaning without quoting the verbs in their context, and I may be wrong. I thought it was just worth while calling attention to the denominative verbs, partly because these are, I think, omitted in grammars, and partly because of the historical interest of their survival from the *aya* form in Sanskrit. If there be, in truth, any reflexive feeling in these verbs, they may be a faint survival of the vanished middle voice.

## THE BENGALI PASSIVE

A friend calls my attention to the following quotation from Bopp: "In Sanserit and Prakrit the passive form is made up by inflection as Sanserit कियते, Prakrit करियेने, it is done. The letter य is inserted to make up the passive form in Sanserit, which is changed to ञ in Prakrit, and thus the Sanserit य is the abbreviated form of या, to go. The full form of या is still used in Bengali to produce the passive verb; as करा याहु = I am made, lit. I go in making. In Sanserit compound passive forms occur, besides the simple in य as in Latin. The Latin *amatum iri*, to be loved, is literally 'to be gone in love'."

To students of Bengali this is interesting, because it asserts that the proper passive form in that language is *ami karā yāi*, and not *āmāke karāi yāy*. Grammarians written in Bengali do not mention the passive at all, probably because there is no specific or exclusive passive form. But in a note to Paṇḍit Nakuleśvar Vidyābhūṣaṇ's little *Vāṅgīlī Vyākaraṇ* is a statement which may be roughly translated as follows: "Sometimes the meaning of the root *yāi*, 'go,' becomes *haui*, 'become.' For instance, *eman lok dekhā (dṛṣṭa) yāy (hau)*, 'such a person is seen.' *Australiyāy sonā pāra yāy*, 'gold is found in Australia.' *Panic-ti ṭiki laux yāte pāre*, 'five rupees can be taken.'"

The cases cited being all in the third person of the non-honorific form do not very clearly show which of the alternative constructions is intended, but of the first example it may be said that the nominative *lok* and not the objective *lok-ke* is used.

Grammarians written for the use of Englishmen are divided. Beames and his original, Syāmā Carāṇ Sirkar, have the form *ami karā yāi*. Wenger (in G. H. Rouse's edition) and Mr. R. P. De in his *Bengali: Literary and Colloquial*

have the form *amake kara gay*. Neither authority seems to have any doubt, nor mentions an alternative construction. *Prima facie* one would expect this form of the passive in *yā* (the passive idea can be expressed in other ways in Bengali) to resemble the similar passive in Hindi. Thus, the Hindi phrase *koi strī mārt jāti thī*, "some woman was being beaten," might be rendered into Bengali as *kona strī mārā jāitechilen*, though, according to Wenger and De, it should be *kona strī-ke mārā jāitechila*. The question, in short, is whether *mārti* is a participle or a verbal noun and the subject of *jāitechila*.

It happened that I found in reading the expression *tini yuddhe marā gān*, "he was killed in battle," where *marā* is plainly a participle, since the words for "he" and "wont" are in the honorific form and "agree" with one another (I have found other such cases). I ventured to submit this case to Mr. R. P. De, and, in view of the statement in his grammar, begged him to decide between the alternative constructions (1) *tini yuddhe marā gayā* and (2) *tinhake yuddhe marā gayā*. Mr. De thought both forms might be correct, but considered that they would have a slight difference of sense. (1) he thought would have the sense of *tini yuddhe marā paden* "he died (not necessarily in fight) on the battle-field" while (2) was the equivalent of *tinhake yuddhe mārīpa phān hāla*, "he was slain in battle."

Obviously this distinction of meaning would not occur in other cases where the two forms were used alternatively, but Mr. De defended the use of *mārā dhara* etc. as verbal nouns for an interesting reason. "In the case of the verb *deka* 'to call' you cannot say *amā dāte hān* 'I am called, but must say *amake dāte hāy* 'to me a calling happens.'" That is, Mr. De instinctively thinks of a case in which an unmistakable verbal noun is used, and infers that the use of a homomorphous verbal adjective is improper. Perhaps this is the process through

which the construction is going in Bengali. In Hindi there is no chance of confusion between the verbal noun *jāna* and the verbal adjective *jāta*, but in Bengali there is the same homomorphism as in the case of our "beating" and "a beating", and the nominal form seems to be asserting itself at the expense of the adjectival form.

If I have dwelt at some length on a somewhat elementary difficulty, it has been in the hope of showing that a foreigner may sometimes be of use in calling attention to a difficulty which escapes a native from sheer familiarity. It is curious, however, that in grammars for Europeans there should in this case be so complete a difference of opinion. I think this is due to the fact that in by far the greater number of cases (as in the two last examples cited from *Vidyābhāṣaṇ*) it is impossible to say from the form of the phrase which construction is actually used. No doubt some speakers mentally use one, some the other. It is only when one brings forward such a phrase as *cī śakti nā thākile, auck granthakar nārā paden* that they are compelled to examine the machinery of familiar turns of expression.

J. D. A.

#### SOME REMARKS ON CHAU JU-KUA'S CHU FAN CHI

I venture to offer a few observations on the above-named work by way of supplement to Mr. Hopkins' interesting review of it in the last number of this Journal.

*Palembatug*, p. 63, n. 2. It is more than likely that *Ling-ya-mön* may be Singapore (not Lingga) Straits; see Journ. Straits Branch RAS., No. 60, pp. 25 seq.

p. 64, n. 4. The Malay term for the garment in question, or a particular mode of wearing it, is *kēmban*.

n. 6. Sap is drawn both from the coconut palm and from the *Arenga saccharifera*, either for drink or for boiling down into a sugar closely resembling the Canadian maple



sugar. In the Malay Peninsula (where the conditions much resemble those of Sumatra) the coconut sugar is made chiefly in the coast villagen, the other kind a few miles inland; at least, it was so in Malacca territory twenty years ago. This is *pace* John Crawford, whom, with other old writers, the editors quote, apparently in preference to later and better authorities, more than I like to see (cf. *Encycl. v. Ned-Indië*, iii, pp. 183-4, s.v. *Palmwijn*).

p. 65, n. 12. The title *arnung* is used in Celebes and is not Malay at all. What Malay word is transcribed by the very un-Malay-looking *lung-tsing* I cannot imagine. Possibly these are simply Chinese words intended for a translation of some Indian title beginning with *naga*, the equivalent of *lung*. *Tsing* is given in Giles as meaning *inter alia* "essence spirit". But *lung* appears there also in phrases where it merely means "imperial". Cannot the words represent some conventional expression like "His Majesty"?

p. 66, n. 17. It is an anachronism to suggest the title Sultan for a chieftain ruling at Palembang in the tenth century. Islam did not become the established religion there till several hundred years later.

*Langkasa*, p. 68. If the sailing time between this place and Tan ma ling is correctly given in the text it seems doubtful whether the latter can be Kuantan as six days would be rather a short time considering the weak monsoon of the Straits of Malacca.

*Ko lo an*, p. 69. The identification of this place with any spot on the Malay Peninsula seems to me very doubtful, especially in view of what is said about its having had a temple covered with bronze tiles. That sounds much more like Indo-Chinese culture than Malay, and I suspect that the place was to the north of Langkasuka, not to the south. Might it not have been Phatthalung? The names agree sufficiently. The difficulty

is its alleged tributary relation to Palembang, together with the statement that it was an emporium visited by Arab traders. Apparently it was already subject to Palembang before A.D. 1178 (*Ling-wa-tai-ta*, reference in n. 1). We know so little about the history of the Peninsula that we cannot say for certain whether it had been colonized by the Malays at this period or even in Chau Ju-kua's time, some fifty years later. It is quite possible that it had. Neither do we know the extreme northern limits of the Malay settlements. They may at one time have extended up to Phatthalung, holding a temporary sway over an older Indo-Chinese population. It appears that in the last quarter of the thirteenth century the Siamese in the course of their southern conquests came into hostile contact with the Malays, presumably in the north of the Peninsula or on the isthmus which connects it with Indo-China, i.e. this very region (cf. BEFFO, iv, p. 242 and Journ. Straits Branch RAS. No. 53 pp. 161-2).

*Kien pu*, p. 71. It is probable that this is not Kampar but Pulau Kompai, further to the north, which is called Kampe in the *Nāgarakṛtāgama* (cf. *Encycl. v. Ned-Indie*, iv, p. 384, s.v. *Tochten*). There is also a river Kompeh, which runs into the Jambi River at Muara Kompeh. But this does not seem to fit the position indicated in the text: it is too near Palembang and too far from Lambéri.

*Java* p. 80, n. 7. There is no Malay word *rakryan* (here misprinted *rakyrin*). It is Old Javanese, which is quite another matter.

*Central Java*, p. 86, n. 7. Ping-ya-i may represent Banggai, off the east of Celebes (the *Nāgarakṛtāgama* calls it Banggawi); and on the analogy of Tiwu (= Timat = Timor) I suggest that the next three characters, here given as Wu-nu-ku, should be read Mat-nu-ku, which may represent the Malay Maluku

(or Mēluku), i.e. the Moluccas. The *Nāgarakṛtāgama* mentions Maloko after Ambon (i.e. Amboyna).

*Malabar*, p. 91, n. 16. Gerini is quite wrong in saying that there is no evidence of the existence of the name Kōdah before the end of the fifteenth century. It is mentioned among a number of other places on the Peninsula in the *Nāgarakṛtāgama*, which dates from about the middle of the fourteenth century. Gerini has a somewhat exaggerated prejudice against Kōdah: it is not indeed the hub of the universe, but it happens to be the first point on the peninsula which a navigator would reach if he came from Ceylon and took the route from Point de Galle to Achin Head. And that is the natural and obvious line to take as soon as mere coasting voyages have been abandoned. I cannot see why Kōdah should not be the Ki to of Chau Ju-kua.

*Orang Laut*, p. 151, n. 1. I do not think Ma lo-nu can be identified with Malayu but it may perhaps refer to the Mēlanan (or Mēlano) Dayak tribe of Borneo. The *Nāgarakṛtāgama* mentions Malano together with other Bornean names.

*Pasai*, p. 152. One is very much tempted to suppose that this stands for Pasè (or Pasai) in North Eastern Sumatra, but I have no evidence that the place existed as early as 1178.

*Borneo*, p. 158, n. 5. The native name for the *Asiopo macharifera*, which is here transcribed *set nung* is the Malay *kubong*; this is at any rate in Malacca the commonest name for the species though there are others (cf. *Encycl. d. Ned-Indie*, i, p. 44 s.v. *Arina*).

*Sweet Benzoin*, p. 198. I suggested some years ago (*Journ. Straits Branch RAS*, No. 30 pp. 306-7) that the first two syllables of the Chinese name for this product merely transcribe the Malay name *kēmūngan* (or *kēmūnyan*) with which the Cambodian and Talaing equivalents are also practically identical.

I should like, finally, to add my tribute of admiration for the work of the learned editors of this volume. Their introduction and notes contain a vast amount of interesting and valuable information. But it seems to me that their system of transliterating the proper names, etc., given by their author does not follow at all closely the dialect which he appears to have had in view, and consequently does not always facilitate identification.

C. O. BLAGDEN.

### SOME SUFI LIVES

The sense assigned by Professor Goldziher to the passage cited by Mr. Amedroz (JRAS., 1912, p. 562, n. 1) is shown to be correct by the discussion in Abū Tālib al-Makki's *Kāf al-Kulāb*, ii, 61, Cairo, 1310. We are there told that "*sama*' (i.e. the hearing of songs) is a science only suitable for persons of purity: if anyone hears [mystical songs couched in erotic language] in a turbid state it will try him and do him harm; owing to insufficient commune with the Divine Being (*naḥṣan al-mushahadat*) if a man hear [such songs] from the side of the music and the tune, it will bring upon him the same as befalls him who looks at the hands in a gift: for the tune is a vessel for the ideas just as the hands are a vessel for the divine provision: the true looker takes his provision from the hand and looks no more [at the giver's hand], and the true hearer takes the ideas from the tune and pays no attention to the music thereof". The doctrine to which the writer alludes is that according to which no gratitude belongs to the giver of charity, since the ascetic ought to look beyond the intermediate to the real giver, God. Where similarly the hearer is sufficiently advanced to be deaf to everything but the indirect appeal of the mystical songs they will benefit him: but if they affect him either as music or as erotic, they will harm him.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

## A SUPPOSED MISSING MS. OF THE ARABIAN NIGHTS

In the volume of the JRAS. for 1911, p. 219, Mr. Duncan B. Macdonald asks a question about a lost MS. of the *Arabian Nights* which he supposes to have belonged to Sir William Jones. I suggest, in reply, that there is no evidence that Jones ever was the owner of a MS. of the *Arabian Nights*. No such MS. is mentioned in the catalogue of the Jones MSS. made by Sir Charles Wilkins in 1798, and which is published at the end of the thirteenth volume of Jones' works, ed. 1807. William Jones, Esq., had such a MS. "in his possession" when at Oxford, and before he went to India, but this is a different matter from his having been the owner of it. My belief is that Jones simply had the loan, either from Dr. White or from Wortley Montague, of the seven-volume MS. now in the Bodleian. Jones was acquainted with Wortley Montague (Lady Mary's son), and in a letter to Mr. Howard dated October 4, 1774, and published in vol. i, p. 224 of the edition of his works above mentioned he thanks Mr. Montague for having kindly sent him a manuscript of the poems of Matanabi, see his note to No. 153 of his catalogue, ed. 1807, p. 424. Dr. White was a Fellow of Wadham, and must have been at Oxford many years before he became Laudian Professor. He was at one time Bampton Lecturer, and is referred to by Gibbon as Mr. White, the Arabic professor. White's copy of the *Arabian Nights* was we know the copy which originally belonged to Wortley Montague but there is no reason to suppose that he did not get it till the Wortley Montague MSS. were sold. There is a reference to White's copy in an article by Jonathan Scott vol. i, p. 245 of Sir W. Ouseley's *Oriental Collections*, and in vol. ii of the same work, pp. 25-35, there is a list made by Jonathan Scott, of White's seven volumes. Scott also speaks there of a fragmentary MS. of the *Arabian Nights* which he

obtained from James Anderson, see p. 34. At p. 246 of vol. i, Scott quotes a passage from Dr. Russell's *History of Aleppo*, in which it is stated that Mr. Professor White, of Oxford, has got a copy (of the *Arabian Nights*) which formerly belonged to the late Mr. Wortley Montagu. Russell's book was first published in 1756, but I do not know if the passage quoted, or any part of it, appears in the first edition.

In conclusion, I would point out that it is highly improbable that Jones, while an impecunious student at Oxford, could have been the owner of an extensive Arabic manuscript.

H. BEVERIDGE.

## LA FONDATION DE GORJE

### *Communication*

1. Le conseil de la fondation a éprouvé une perte douloureuse par le décès de M. J. A. Sillem : au mois de mai 1912 la section des lettres de l'Académie royale d'Amsterdam l'a remplacé par M. le docteur T. J. de Boer, professeur à l'université d'Amsterdam. Le conseil est donc composé maintenant comme suit : MM. C. Snouck Hurgronje (président), H. T. Karsten, M. Th. Houtsma, T. J. de Boer, et C. van Vollenhoven (secrétaire-trésorier).

2. Le conseil a accordé une subvention modérée pour faire illustrer une communication de M. N. Scheltema, imprimée par la section des sciences de l'Académie royale d'Amsterdam, et se rapportant à la détermination astronomique (en 1910/11) de la position de la Mecque ainsi que de la route joignant Djiddah à la Mecque.

3. Le capital de la fondation a été augmenté d'un montant nominal de 2,000 florins hollandais (4,000 francs), provenant de revenus antérieurs, de sorte qu'il se monte actuellement à 21,500 florins (43,000 francs). En outre, au mois de novembre 1912 les rentes disponibles montaient à plus de 1,800 florins (3,600 francs).

4. On se permet d'attirer l'attention sur ce qu'il est encore disponible un certain nombre d'exemplaires de la reproduction de la *Hamāsah* d'al-Buhturi. En 1909 la fondation a fait paraître chez l'éditeur Brill à Leyde cette reproduction photographique du manuscrit de Leyde réputé unique. C'est au profit de la fondation que ces exemplaires sont vendus; le prix en est de 200 francs. Ainsi les acheteurs contribueront à atteindre le but que se propose la fondation: de favoriser l'étude des langues orientales et de leur littérature.

*Novembre, 1912.*

## NOTICES OF BOOKS

### THE SOUTHERN DRAVIDIANS

Scholars who are masters both of Dravidian and of Indo-Aryan literatures are rare, and Dr Hastings has been fortunate in securing Mr. Frazer's co-operation in writing the article on South Indian Dravidians in the fifth volume of the *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*. The article is a summary of the religious history of the southern Dravidians, and its chief interest consists in the very complete, though condensed, account of the Śaiva Siddhānta. The Vaiṣṇavas are also dealt with, but quite properly in less detail, for the tenets of this aspect of Hīnduism have had a good deal of literature devoted to them in Europe during the past few years.

That Śiva,<sup>1</sup> the Red God, Rudra, was an old Dravidian deity of southern India incorporated into the North Indian pantheon, is, I believe, doubted by few; on the other hand, most scholars also consider that the germ of the formulated doctrines that now obtain in the Siddhānta reached the Dravidians from the north.<sup>2</sup> The Vēdānta doctrines of northern India appear to have been well known in the South in the fifth century A.D., and their main features had been incorporated into Śaiva devotional literature by the seventh or eighth centuries,<sup>3</sup> the earliest work in which they were formulated being the Tamil Śiva Jñāna Bodham of the early part of the thirteenth century.

<sup>1</sup> As is well known, "Śiva," besides being a Sanskrit word meaning "auspicious", is also a Dravidian word meaning "red".

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Professor Barnett in JRS., 1910, 707 ff.

<sup>3</sup> In the early centuries of the Christian era it was Śaivism, not Vaiṣṇavism, that supplied the general needs of those who craved for a personal God. See ERK. II, 546r, and Hopkins, *Religions of India*, 498 ff.



For an account of these doctrines the reader is referred to the article itself. Here I would merely draw attention to the family likeness that exists between the two great forms of South Indian Hinduism. By one who like the present writer has devoted his chief attention to the Vaisnavism of the southern Bhagavatas, it might almost be said of Śiva, *mutato nomine de te fabula narratur*. There is the same inculcation of *bhakti* devoted to a First Cause, who is defined by the same terms, *sat*, *cit*, and *ananda*; the same claim that the belief is *advaita*, and yet the same contention that the Cosmos is not an unreal dream product of *Māyā*. There are similar systems of phases of conditioned spirit connecting the immaterial First Cause with the material universe, —amongst the Bhāgavatas the three *vyñānas*, amongst the Śaivas the five *paratattvas*, Nada, Vindu, Sakti Śiva, Īvara and Rudra.<sup>1</sup> The Śaiva treatment of the blissful trinity, *sat cit ananda*, closely resembles that which we find in the Bhagavata Śuddhādvaita system of the Rudra —note the name Saṅhpradāya, and in both systems the same word *anu* is used for the soul, and the same verb *tanu-dha* for the obscuration of one or more of the members of the trinity from the soul. Nay, even in the sects of each church the same similes are employed and each has its "kitten" and its "monkey" school, perpetuating the distinction between irresistible and co-operative grace.

While the Western study of southern Vaisnavism is quite modern that of the Śaiva Siddhānta has been maintained for more than sixty years.\* But this study has been fitful for the number of Tamil scholars has always been small, and as one went there was not always another to fill his place. Hence so far as I am aware

<sup>1</sup> So the *Tattva Kāṇṭha* (JACS. iv. 13). In the *pratyak* know-  
ledge (*jñāna*) predominates (14). Hence Mr. Froom designated this  
*tattva* as "pure knowledge".

<sup>2</sup> Housington's valuable series of articles on the *Saiva dharma* commence in the second volume of the JACS. (1931).

Mr. Frazer's is the first formal account in the English language of this belief as a whole, and is therefore the more welcome. Its perusal has suggested to me a problem that hardly falls within its compass, and yet is closely connected with it. We grant that Śiva was a Dravidian god and that he originally belonged to the south of India. But there is another Śiva, the dread God of northern India, the son-in-law both of Dakṣa<sup>1</sup> and of the Himālaya, the husband both of Sati and of Umā Haimāvati (*Kēna Upaniṣad*, iii, 12), the tribal god of the Khasas of Gōrakṣa, who expelled Buddhism from the Valley of Nēpāl, and the god whose great prophet in northern India was Gōrakṣanātha. At the present time these two gods, the Śiva of the Himālaya and he of Draviḍa, are, and have been for many centuries, worshipped as one and the same person, and the problem is "when and under what circumstances did these two deities become combined". The Dravidians do not appear ever to have reached the Himālaya. If language is any test, the earliest inhabitants of that tract of whom we have any trace seem to have been Mundās, who were conquered from the north-west by Khasas and from the north by Tibeto-Burmans. The language of the Khasas was an old form of the Piśāca languages of the North-West Frontier, and all Indian tradition shows the Himalayan Śiva, with his Piśāca hordes, as having his real home far beyond the Hindū Kush. In the article already referred to and elsewhere, Professor Barnett has shown how closely connected is the worship of Śiva in Kashmir (a "Piśāca" country) with the southern Śaiva Siddhānta. Was the northern deity originally named "Śiva", or was he simply the Mahādēva,

<sup>1</sup> Can the fact of the close etymological connexion between "Dakṣa" and *dakṣiṇa*, "the South," have any bearing on the point? Dakṣa, whose daughter was Śiva's first wife and also the first "suttie", was destroyed and revived by him. The second father-in-law was the Himālaya, while the second wife's name was Umā, a word of which the Aryan etymology is at least doubtful.

the Great God, to whom was subsequently applied the southern appellation, or had each the same word for his name, although in one case that word was Aryan and in the other Dravidian? That the later ideas regarding Śiva-Durgā are the result of syncretism most people agree, but that is not the point in question. Above these - apart from the history of Kālī and her bloody rites - there loom through the mists of antiquity the two giant forms of the North and of the South. When and how did they become one? That is a question which no one is more competent to examine than Mr. Frazer, and I venture to express the hope that some day, when he has time, he will devote himself to its solution.

GEORGE A. GRIERSON.

CAMBRIDGE.

December 10, 1912.

**KALIDASA'S MEGHADUTA**, edited from manuscripts with the Commentary of Vallabhadeva and provided with a complete Sanskrit-English Vocabulary. By E. HULTZSCH. Royal Asiatic Society, Prize Publications Fund, Vol. III.

With the publication of this work Professor Hultzsch has made a new and important departure in classical Sanskrit research. Though several commentaries on Vedic texts have been critically edited in Europe, this is the first on any classical Kāvya that has been dealt with according to Western critical standards. The value of the book is greatly enhanced by the fact that it supplies the earliest known scholium on Kālidāsa's masterpiece, giving us the text of the *Meghadūta* as current in Kāśmīr about 900 A.D., five or six centuries before the time of Mallinātha,<sup>1</sup> whose commentary has hitherto dominated the text and interpretation of this famous poem. The evidence of

<sup>1</sup> On Mallinātha's date see Keith, *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, Appendix (Oxford, 1900), p. 22.

Vallabhadeva's recension will undoubtedly contribute towards bringing the critically constituted text of the *Meghadūta* considerably nearer to the form in which it left the hands of the poet himself. It is a strange phenomenon that a Kāvya which is perhaps more widely read than any other should, though a century has elapsed since the appearance of H. H. Wilson's *editio princeps* in 1813, till now have remained subject to uncertainty in three respects—the genuineness of several of its stanzas, the original order of the genuine stanzas, and the authenticity of a large number of its readings.

Vallabhadeva's text of the *Meghadūta* contains only 111 stanzas,<sup>1</sup> or ten fewer than Mallinātha's. The remarkable critical acumen of Gildemeister is well illustrated by the fact that, in spite of the scanty manuscript material at his disposal, he more than seventy years ago rejected in his edition of the text,<sup>2</sup> nearly all the interpolated stanzas of Mallinātha, retaining only two stanzas not to be found in Vallabhadeva's text. The only other critical edition of the text of the *Meghadūta* that has since appeared is Stenzler's.<sup>3</sup> That very sound scholar, having more critical material at his disposal, rejected the two spurious stanzas retained by Gildemeister. But, curiously enough, he reinstated one<sup>4</sup> which Gildemeister had already excluded and which there can be no doubt is an interpolation.<sup>5</sup> I think we can already assert with confidence that no stanza which does not appear in Vallabhadeva's text is genuine. We have thus come much nearer to certainty regarding the original compass of the poem. The next step will be to ascertain, with the help of the evidence that is now available or may become available, whether the authenticity

<sup>1</sup> The Nepal MS. mentioned below contains 110 stanzas.

<sup>2</sup> Bonn, 1840, with critical notes and a Sanskrit-Latin vocabulary.

<sup>3</sup> Breslau, 1874, with critical notes and a Sanskrit-German vocabulary.

<sup>4</sup> Stanza 110 in his edition, beginning *dr̥ḍhāyicam*.

<sup>5</sup> See p. 64 of Professor Hultzsch's edition. It is omitted in the Nepal MS. of the *Meghadūta*.

of any of the stanzas included in Vallabhadeva's text can be disproved. Two or three at most may ultimately have to be rejected. Doubt has already been cast by Īvarachandra Vidyasagara<sup>1</sup> on 62 and 70 and on the latter by the *Vidyullata*<sup>2</sup> also. Professor Hultzschi's edition contains a useful appendix giving nineteen spurious stanzas with various readings and notes indicating in what editions they occur.

There is also a synoptical table (pp. xv) showing the correspondence in order between the stanzas according to Vallabhadeva and nine other recensions of the *Meghadūta*. This will doubtless prove very useful in investigating the question of the original sequence of the stanzas of the poem. In the meantime I may here point out that two stanzas (85 and 86) which are separated by others in all the other recensions — one, not only appear together in Vallabhadeva but are treated by him as an interdependent couplet.

As regards divergences of reading, I have found on comparing the text of Vallabhadeva with those of Mallinātha and Stenzler, that twenty-five stanzas show no variation, twenty-seven differ in one syllable only, and seventeen in two syllables. Not many go much beyond this; in only four (54, 60, 61, 62<sup>3</sup>) do the discrepancies extend to the equivalent of between one line and one line and a half. I find further that Stenzler, though he was unacquainted with Vallabhadeva's recension, in a large number of cases agrees with the readings of

<sup>1</sup> In his edition of the *Meghadūta*, Calcutta, 1869.

<sup>2</sup> A commentary composed in Cochin State, probably three centuries ago, and edited by Pandit R. V. Krishnamachariar, Kottayam, 1909; see Professor Hultzschi's notes, pp. 31, 32.

<sup>3</sup> This stanza, in which the differences amount to twenty-four syllables, is one of those considered an interpolation by Īvarachandra Vidyasagara. It may be noted that the third line, in which the variations are greatest, in Vallabhadeva's text reads *dhanura vānāḥ vajrasamratāḥ kṛpāyuktāḥ*. The reading of the Nopal MS. is identical with this except that it has *vajala-* for *vajata-*.

Vallabhadeva as opposed to Mallinātha. At the same time, it is pretty clear that Vallabhadeva's readings are often not the original ones. In fact, both his text and Stenzler's are still a considerable way from Kālidāsa's original.

Between Stenzler's time and the appearance of the present edition much important critical material (briefly described by Professor Hultzsch in his preface and utilized in his footnotes) has become available. The most important is that contained in the *Parśvabhīṣadaya*, a Jain poem,<sup>1</sup> which in the form of a biography of the Arhat Parśvanātha includes the whole text of the *Meghadūta*. In this poem, composed in accordance with the process called *śatasapūṣṭana*, the author borrows absolutely unaltered from the *Meghadūta* one or two lines for each stanza, which he completes with words of his own. Its early date alone (before 783 A.D.) would give this work great importance for the textual criticism of the *Meghadūta*. One curious fact proved by it is that many of the spurious verses are very old. For, though it is more than a century anterior to Vallabhadeva's text, it already contains nine of these spurious stanzas,<sup>2</sup> five of which Mallinātha himself five or six centuries later designated as interpolated (*prakṣipta*). Another valuable aid to the criticism of the *Meghadūta* made accessible in recent years is the Tibetan translation of the poem, which has been edited and rendered into German by Dr. Beckh.<sup>3</sup> This version contains six of the spurious stanzas.<sup>4</sup>

With the help of all the new evidence now available the text of the *Meghadūta* as constituted by Stenzler can undoubtedly be much improved. Professor Hultzsch's

<sup>1</sup> Edited by Pathak, Poona, 1904.

<sup>2</sup> The Nepal MS. also has nine spurious stanzas.

<sup>3</sup> Berlin, 1907.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Professor Hultzsch's synoptical table.

...reading. There are among many others I have seen the following:—*bhūyayes* (61),<sup>1</sup> not *bhūyayē*; *dyuṣman brayad* (98),<sup>2</sup> not the vocative *dyuṣman* with *brayad*, the reading of Mallinātha, who is obliged to add the note *bhavan iti śeṣah*! In many cases the variation in form is so slight that the unaided evidence of the MSS. is not sufficient: it may have to be supplemented by considerations of palaeography, grammar, poetics, or the usage of Kālidāsa himself. Thus in 80 Vallabhadeva and Jināsena both read *jānīyās*,<sup>3</sup> while Mallinātha and Stenzler have *jānīthās*. Here the agreement of the oldest evidence favours the former reading: but the fact that Kālidāsa uses the verb *jñā* in the Ātmanepada with the same sense ("recognize") and under similar conditions in another stanza of the *Meghadūta* (63) has to be taken into consideration; and the rule of Pāṇini (i. 3. 76) that the verb *jñā* when uncompounded takes the Ātmanepada, if the action results in an advantage to the agent, seems applicable in the present case. In 67 the moonstones are described as "caused to drip by the pure moonbeams", *visūdaiś ścolitaiś candrapadaiḥ*. Here Stenzler and one of the Vallabhadeva MSS. read *visūdaiś colitaiḥ candrapadaiḥ*, an easier reading (though *colitaiḥ*, "impelled," is much less appropriate) arising from a misunderstanding of the Sandhi. In 58, when the poet is describing the dazzling whiteness of Kailāsa

<sup>1</sup> This is also the reading of the fourteenth century Nepāl MS.

<sup>2</sup> The commentary expressly says that the form in the text is the nominative, not the vocative, and that *brayad* is used because the third person is required (*dyuṣman iti mene kartavyam na IV ānātmanas, brayad iti prathamapuruṣaprayogit*).

<sup>3</sup> This is also the reading of the Nepāl MS.

<sup>4</sup> Visarga being dropped before a sibilant followed by a mute, according to the optional rule stated in the *Vārttika on Pāṇini*, vii. 3. 36. This dropping is required by the *Pratīśākhya*s on Vedic texts. It is applied throughout by Aufrecht in his edition of the *Rigveda*, cf. Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, 78, 2.

towering up to the sky, there occur the three readings, *prutidinam*,<sup>1</sup> "towards all the quarters" (Steinler and two Vallabhadeva MSS),<sup>2</sup> *prutiniyam*, "every night", (Vallabhadeva),<sup>3</sup> and *prutidinam*,<sup>4</sup> "every day." Here the manuscript evidence is pretty equally divided; but the first reading seems to account best for the other two, unless special palaeographical considerations can be adduced to the contrary. As between Vallabhadeva's *prutiniyam* and *prutidinam* the former seems preferable because the suggested contrast between the white mountain and the dark background of the night sky is more appropriate.<sup>5</sup>

It is to be hoped that some old MSS of the *Meghaduta* going back to a time anterior to Mallinatha may turn up so as to furnish textual evidence unaffected by his influence. One such MS dating from 1364 AD which contains the text only from the Library of the Maharaja of Nepal is at present at Oxford for the purpose of being photographed at the Clarendon Press.<sup>6</sup>

Professor Hultsch's edition is based on one Devanagari and three Sarcā MSS. A fifth MS. of Vallabhadeva's commentary is in the British Museum, but Professor Hultsch was unable to come to London in order to collate this one MS.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the alternative readings *prutidinam* and *prutidinam* in Thomas' edition of the *Kālidasa-meghaduta*. Bibliotheca Indica (Calcutta, 1911), p. 157, stanza 504.

<sup>2</sup> Supported by the Nepal MS.

<sup>3</sup> Put upraised by *prutidinam*.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Steinler and Mallinatha.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. the somewhat similar contrast between the dark cloud and the hill (not and) in stanza 15.

<sup>6</sup> This MS. has the reading *prutidinam* in the above passage.

<sup>7</sup> It is most unfortunate that the British Museum is one of the few libraries that still continue the policy of not lending MSS and thus obstructing the progress of scholarship. MSS are on quite a different footing to books, especially Oriental MSS, the students of which are few. The convenience of a resident in London being inconvenienced by not having an Oriental MS. lent for a short time to a public library elsewhere would scarcely ever occur. Oriental scholars are generally poor men who practically never receive any remuneration for editing



His text of the *Meghadūta*, of course, corresponds in all its readings to the commentary<sup>1</sup>. Besides stating the various readings of his MSS. for the text, to which he adds those of Jinaseṇa Mallinātha, and Stenzler, he of course gives the various readings for the commentary also. He has traced all Vallabhadeva's quotations, supplying the exact references in each case. He also occasionally furnishes valuable explanatory or illustrative notes.

Vallabhadeva anonymously quotes the *Mahābhārata*, the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Kumārasambhava*, the *Raghuvamśa*, Manu, and Bhartṛhari; mentioning also Māgha by name.<sup>2</sup> He also refers vaguely in two passages (on stanzas 2 and 23) by the term *kecit* to predecessors, whom he criticizes. It is to be noted that, unlike Mallinātha, he never quotes authorities on lexicography, poetics, metre, and omens. But he is fond of quoting grammatical rules, often referring to Pāṇini, of whose system he evidently had an exact knowledge, as is shown both by his comments on the text, and incidentally by his own practice. Thus he points out (on 15) that according to Pāṇini, viii. 3, 45 the correct form is *dhanuṣkhaṇḍam*. On this point Mallinātha is silent, and apparently all the editions read *dhanuṣkhaṇḍam*. Sometimes Vallabhadeva adversely

texts. That they should have to incur the expense of a long journey as well for the purpose of collating a single MS. is to all a positive hardship. The result is that many a MS. the collator of which might have valuable results, is never consulted at all.

<sup>1</sup> In one stanza (103) he has corrected the reading of the text, which in three MSS. and myself in one, to *sat*, the comment of Vallabhadeva being *he sat quarens*. The critical principle that the text should best represent the commentator's recension does not seem to be recognized in India. At any rate, an Indian scholar, who in a pamphlet published a few years ago was held up as a model of critical achievement, has in the very first line of the first stanza of the *Meghadūta* a different reading from that which Mallinātha explains in the commentary, a reading too which is not in agreement with Pāṇini ii. 1. 39. What is the unfortunate student to do when confronted with such contradictions?

<sup>2</sup> He says nothing about the Buddhist teacher Dharmaja, to whom Mallinātha sees an allusion in stanza 14.

criticizes the grammatical forms used by Kālidāsa. Thus in his comments on 76 he remarks that the use of the participle *śiṅgīt* ("tinkling") is due to carelessness, because *śiṅj* is an Ātmanepada verb. Again, the form *vāsaviṇām* ("belonging to Vāsava or Indra") is, he says, hard to justify on account of Pāṇini, iv. 2, 114.<sup>1</sup> He, himself, in paraphrasing *mā* with the injunctive aorist is scrupulous in employing the imperfect injunctive with *mā sma* only according to Pāṇini, iii. 3, 176, as *mā sma budhayah*, *mā sma bhavat* on stanza 94. He never uses pure imperative forms with *mā*, unlike Mallinātha, who has *māstu*, *mā gaccha*.

He sometimes mentions other readings, which he criticizes. Thus, on stanza 72 he pronounces the reading *grhād* for *grhān* as governed by *uttarena*, "northwards of," to be inferior (*pañcamyantaḥ pāṭhas tv anāryaḥ*). In stanza 2 he has the reading *prāṭmadivase*, "on the last day," which Mallinātha so elaborately refutes. But he was acquainted with the reading *prathamadivase*, "on the first day" of the month Āṣāḍha, for he remarks: "Some people, confused by the similarity in writing of the letter *ś* and the letter *th*, read *prathamā* and manage to arrive at the same sense, saying that the first day is mentioned because the rainy season is in question." "But this," he adds, "is extremely inconsistent." In another passage (25), however, he merely states that some read *apraudha* instead of *praudha*, adding their reason, but without criticizing it.

Sometimes he also criticizes the diction of Kālidāsa himself. Thus, on 25 he says that the use of the word *viśrāma* is due to carelessness (*pramādaja*), though why it is so he does not explain. In another passage (47) he points out that certain adjectives qualifying *kautūhala* should really qualify *netra*. Once (99) he even proposes an emendation, *pratanu* for *tanu ca*, on the ground

<sup>1</sup> According to this rule the adjective should be *śiṅgīṣya*.

that *ca* here has no sense. This emendation has been adopted in the text of Mallinātha, of Stenzler, and of the Nepal MS.

Vallabhadeva's explanation of several words differs from that of Mallinātha. Thus *cali* (35) is according to him a "fold of the skin", while Mallinātha makes it the "handle" of the chowrie. The word *caitya* occurring in a Bahuvrīhi compound (23) is alternatively interpreted as a neuter meaning a "Buddhist temple" (*buddhalaya*), or a masculine meaning a "forest tree famous for its great girth", while Mallinātha paraphrases it with "road-side tree" (*rathyāvrkṣa*). The sense attributed by Vallabhadeva to some words is very strange. Thus *cīṭaka*, the well-known rainbird, and *sāraṅga*, "spotted deer," are both explained by *mayūra*, "peacock," and *nīla*, "dark-blue," is twice stated to mean *harita*, "green"!

Several words occurring in the text are explained by others which are much more obscure, as *apamāṣṭa* by *utpamāṣṭa* (26), *phena* by *diṇḍira* (50), *prarabha* by *sphiraṃ* (16), *saṃgīta* twice (56, 64) by *gṛāmanikā*, *kṣobha* by *utphalana* (92), *reṭi* by *varṇikā kanti* (75). Professor Hultzsch has given a complete Sanskrit-English vocabulary of all the words in the text of the *Meghadūta* at the end of his edition. It would have been well had he explained, either there or in the footnotes, at least all the obscure words that occur in the commentary also, for they will prove a stumbling-block to beginners and probably to a good many others also.

Vallabhadeva's chief aim is evidently to elucidate the meaning of Kālidāsa on all points. He accordingly does not crowd his commentary with learned quotations to the detriment of interpretation. His style being simple, direct, and concise, makes the sense of the text as a rule clearer than does Mallinātha, whose commentary is about twice as long, being overloaded with quotations, and much more

difficult for the beginner to understand with its involved style and discussions.

The edition seems to be singularly free from misprints. Though I have carefully read through both text and commentary, I have discovered only two very slight inaccuracies (in addition to the three corrected in the errata): *kūlartham* for *kriḍ-* (p. 3), and *śikhādhama* for *śikhā dāma* (p. 45). The top of the letter *o* has, in the process of printing, been broken off in *lola* and *krōbha* (p. 17), *°vopapādyat* (p. 18), and *ghoṣam* (p. 35).

The unusual spelling *asru* (pp. 3, 46, 103) and *śtrika* (p. 44) is, I suppose, that of Kāśmir, as is *duḡala* (63) for *dukāla*.

Besides the present commentary Vallabhadeva also wrote others on the *Raghuvamśa*, the *Kumārasambhava*,<sup>1</sup> on Māgha's *Śiśupālavadha*, on Mayūra's *Sāryakṛtaka*, and on Ratnākara's *Vakroktiṭiṣāsika*.<sup>2</sup> Professor Hultsch has evidently studied that on the *Śiśupālavadha* with great care, for in his preface (pp. x, xi) he gives a list of the references to numerous works and authors found by him in the commentary on the first fifteen *suras* of the poem.<sup>3</sup> If he could see his way to editing that commentary also in the manner in which he has dealt with that on the *Meghadūta*, he would confer a great benefit on Sanskrit scholars.

From what I have said it is probably clear that Professor Hultsch's edition is not only an important work of research, but also has considerable educational value. It is, in my opinion, the best book yet published for introducing beginners to the study of native Indian commentaries on Sanskrit Kāvya.

A. A. MACDONELL.

<sup>1</sup> I may here draw attention to the fact that in the Stein Collection of Sanskrit MSS. from Kāśmir there are copies of Vallabhadeva's commentaries on the *Raghuvamśa* and the *Kumārasambhava*; see JRAS. for 1912, pp. 506, 508.

<sup>2</sup> Edited in the *Kāryamālā*.

<sup>3</sup> See also the supplementary list in the JRAS. for 1912, p. 735.

### THREE PLAYS OF BHASA IN THE TRIVANDRUM SANSKRIT SERIES

The October number of the *Journal* (pp 1109-10) contained a note on the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series down to vol. xiv. Since then I have received five more volumes, all published in the year 1912. The last two of these are of minor importance, xviii being a somewhat extensive *śloka* of the nature of a *kāvya* by Nārāyaṇa, a poet who lived in the latter half of the sixteenth century, while xix, entitled *Mānameyodaya*, is an easy introduction to the Pūrvaśīmāṇsa system of philosophy, partly by the same Nārāyaṇa, partly by a later author. But the preceding three volumes (xv-xvii) deserve the close attention of Sanskrit scholars. These also have been edited by my indefatigable friend Gaṇapati Śāstri, whose acquaintance I made five years ago at Trivandrum, and who as head librarian there showed me over the Palace Library, which contains a well-arranged and well cared-for collection of over 2,000 Sanskrit MSS. Here we have three plays, entitled *Śaṅkha nṛpaṭa*, *Pratijñā-gaṇḍadharaṇa*, and *Pañca rāṭa*, the importance of which lies in the fact that they appear to be three of the long-lost works of the once famous poet Bhaṣa.

When touring in search of Sanskrit MSS in South Travancore Gaṇapati Śāstri discovered a cask between three and four centuries old written on palm leaves in Malayāḷam characters and containing ten complete plays all hitherto unknown. All these dramas have certain structural characteristics in common. Without a *pañcī* or invocatory stanza they begin with the words *na āyante tatāḥ prarūṇāti sātendrakreśaḥ*. The *prastāva* or introductory dialogue is here called *śleṣṭāva*. In this prologue (unlike that of Kālidāsa and other dramatists) the name of neither author nor work is mentioned. Every one of these plays ends with the same prayer followed by the

title (e.g. *svapna-nāṭakam avasitam*). Another feature of these dramas is that they have several passages in common, as pointed out by the editor in his introduction (p. xix). They therefore all appear to be the work of the same author. Of the most important and longest of the three now published, the *Svapna-nāṭaka*, which consists of six acts, the Pandit succeeded in obtaining two other copies, the various readings of which are given at the end of the volume. In one of these MSS. the title appears as *Svapna-vāsanadattā*, which is identical with the title of a work mentioned by two commentators of the tenth and the twelfth century, and attributed by Rājasekhara (c. 900 A.D.) in his *Saktimuktavalt* to the poet Bhāsa.<sup>1</sup> Vāmana, moreover, in his *Kārya-lampkāra-sūtra-ṛtī* (iv. 2) quotes a *śloka* occurring in the present edition of the *Svapna-nāṭaka*. (It is, however, to be noted that in the *Dhṛanyāloka-locana* of Abhinavagupta a line is quoted as occurring in the *Svapna-vāsanadattā* which is not to be found in the Trivandrum text.) On the strength of the foregoing evidence Gaṇapati Śāstri identifies all these ten hitherto unknown plays as the works of Bhāsa. The poet Bhāsa himself is mentioned by Kālidāsa in his *Malavikāgnimitra*<sup>2</sup> as "far-famed" (*prathita-yakae*) and alluded to as ancient (*purāṇa*); and Bāṇa, in a *śloka* of his *Harṣacarita*,<sup>3</sup> speaks of Bhāsa as having "gained splendour by his plays (*nāṭakaiḥ*) with introductions spoken by the stage manager" (*sūtradhāra-kṛtārambhaiḥ*).<sup>4</sup> Bhāsa is also mentioned by name in a verse occurring in two

<sup>1</sup> See vol. xv, Introduction, p. xxi; cf. Thomas, *Karṇadrasana-samuccayaḥ*, Bibliotheca Indica, 1911, p. 87.

<sup>2</sup> Shankar Pandit's edition, 1889, p. 2; cf. note, p. 164; see also Weber, *Sanskrit Literature*, p. 206, n. 213.

<sup>3</sup> See Cowell & Thomas' translation, p. 2, *śloka* 15.

<sup>4</sup> Gaṇapati Śāstri understands this to mean "plays directly begun by the stage manager" (i.e. without a *śāsti*) as a characterization of Bhāsa's plays.

anthologies<sup>1</sup>. There are at least ten stanzas which in various anthologies<sup>2</sup> are attributed to Bhāsa. One of these in the *Kaṇvadrachana samuccayaḥ*<sup>3</sup> is ascribed to Lakṣmīdhara but in two other anthologies is attributed to Bhāsa.

From the fact that neither author nor work is named in the *sthapana* Guṇapati Śāstri argues that these plays must have been written before the practice of mentioning them there came into use. He moreover infers from a passage of Bhāmaha's *Kavyalankara*, and from the fact that Bhāmaha mentions a number of poets unknown to us but says not a word about Kālidāsa, that that author could not have known Kālidāsa. He also endeavours to show that Bhāmaha, who virtually quotes a passage from the *Pratijñā-nūṭika*<sup>4</sup> of Bhāsa, cannot have known the *Brhatkatha* of Guṇadīya, and must therefore have been prior to the latter and have lived in the first century B.C. He thus concludes that Bhāsa, whom Bhāmaha quotes, cannot be placed later than the third or second century B.C. Finally, he points out that a stanza found in the *Pratijñā-gaṇpanḍharyāna* of Bhāsa occurs in the *Arthasāstra* of Kautilya, whom he considers to have been the borrower. If this view were correct Bhāsa would even go back to the fourth century B.C. at any rate on the assumption that Professor Jacobi, in his recent critical examination of the authenticity of the *Arthasāstra*,<sup>5</sup> is right in concluding that suspicion of the genuineness of Kautilya's work is unjustified and that its genuineness is supported by a number of internal reasons.

<sup>1</sup> Thomas, op. cit., Introduction, p. 91.

<sup>2</sup> Vallabhadra's *Sukhyatarāṅga*, 1296, 1353, 1619, 1628, 1821, 1904, *Sarvagadharaparikṣita*, 3202, 3630, *Harikarṇāma*, P. 125. Reprinted in p. 38; JRAS, 1891, pp. 331-2.

<sup>3</sup> 163 in Thomas' edition, p. 50; cf. Peterson JRAS, 1891, p. 332.

<sup>4</sup> The abbreviated title for *Pratijñā-gaṇpanḍharyāna* (vol. xxi).

<sup>5</sup> In *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, xxxviii, pp. 832-46, 1912.

But the validity of several of the arguments in this chronological chain of reasoning is doubtful. We do not in the meantime seem justified in admitting that these works of Bhāsa, if authentic are earlier than about the second century A.D.

Ganapati Sastri is enthusiastic on the high literary merits of these plays, comparing several passages with similar ones in Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti (pp. xxxvii f.).

It is noteworthy that one of this group of plays, the *Cārudatta-nāṭaka*, and Śūdraka's *Mṛcchakatikā* contain very similar and to some extent verbally identical prose passages as well as some *śloka*s in common, and that Cārudatta is the central character in both dramas. One of these two plays must therefore be based on the other. Ganapati Sastri argues that the *Mṛcchakatikā*, which is much the longer, must be the later of the two because the author is not mentioned in the *Cārudatta-nāṭaka*. Supposing this view to be correct, we should arrive at the highly interesting conclusion that Bhāsa was the author of the original form of the *Mṛcchakatikā*. It may here be added that the famous *śloka* beginning *limpativa tatma 'ngam*, which is found in many anthologies and works on poetics,<sup>1</sup> occurs both in the *Mṛcchakatikā*<sup>2</sup> and the *Cārudatta-nāṭaka*, as well as one of the other unpublished plays assumed to be by Bhāsa.<sup>3</sup>

It may prove to be a point of some critical importance that the well-known line *yatra kṛtṛ yadā na śādhyaṭi ka 'tra doṣaḥ* occurs as the first line of a stanza in the *Dūtāghaṭakā*, one of these plays, while it is elsewhere the fourth of an otherwise different and often quoted stanza beginning *udyojanam puruṣaśiṅgham*, which appears in the introduction of the *Hitopaleśa*<sup>4</sup> and elsewhere.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Thomas, op. cit., p. 105, and cf. Pischel, Introduction to Rudraṭa's *Śṛṅgīratīkā*, pp. 16 sqq.

<sup>2</sup> Ed. Stenzler, p. 14.

<sup>3</sup> Ganapati Sastri's Introduction to vol. xv, p. xxiii.

<sup>4</sup> *Śloka* 22. <sup>5</sup> See Böhtlingk, *Indische Sprüche*, 1, 253.



If the authenticity of these plays can be established by carefully following up all external clues and critically examining all the internal evidence, the recovery of the long-lost works of a once celebrated poet, together with the ascertainment of his approximate date, will prove an event of the highest interest to the Sanskrit world and of far-reaching importance for the literary history of India.

A. A. MACDONELL.

**THE DAŚARŪPA, A TREATISE ON HINDU DRAMATURGY BY DHANIKĀJAYA.** Now first translated from the Sanskrit with the text and an introduction and notes by GEORGE C. O. HAAS. Columbia University Indo-Iranian Series, vol. vii. 8vo. New York, 1912.

In the rich scholastic literature of India, Rhetoric or *Ars Poetica*, *Alaṃkāra*, holds a prominent place; and despite the pedantry into which its professors—and especially its later professors—often lapsed, a knowledge of it is indispensable to the student of Sanskrit literature, for it is a development of the scholastic tradition which shaped the classical masterpieces. The idea of "wood-notes wild" is foreign to India; every Hindu poet wears with more or less ease, according to his genius, the chains of panditship. But because it is so profoundly tinged with the immemorial spirit of Indian scholasticism, *Alaṃkāra* is a study that is beset with difficulties; and we cannot withhold our tribute of admiration from Mr. Haas, who with the characteristic intrepidity of the American nation has approached the *Daśa-rūpa*.

The present edition contains an introduction dealing with the author, his literary method, life, and times, *Dhanika* and his commentary on the *Daśa-rūpa*, and an account of the present and previous editions, after which comes the text in Roman type with translation, an abstract of *Dhanika's* commentary (unfortunately very meagre),

and notes, followed by indexes. The notes are likely to be very useful, as they give many references to Indian and European works which will greatly aid the student. Probably the least satisfactory part of the work is the translation, which is often so free as to border on inaccuracy. Thus, in i, 2 he renders *bhāvakah* by "senses" and "sensibilities", in flat defiance of Dhanika, who rightly explains it as "worshippers" and "men of taste". In i, 6 *vyutpatti* is not "knowledge" but "education". i, 19b he renders "that which contains an incident connected with him [is called] *ādhikārika*"; it would be more correct to translate it "a continuous course of action brought to a successful issue by him is *ādhikārika*". *Kārya* (i, 24) is not "dénouement", nor is *apāya* (i, 32) "risk". In i, 47 *adbhutārśa* is not "intentness upon something marvelous", but rather "the being seized by a sense of miracle". He renders *arma* by "joke" in pp. 16-17, and by "pleasantry" on p. 68, but with curious inconsistency makes it "affection" on p. 69. His uncertainty becomes more marked when he enters the arcana of Alampkāra, the theory of Rasa and Bhāva in book iv. He misses the whole point in translating iv, 1, "Sentiment results when a Permanent State produces a pleasurable sensation," etc.; the idea is that a permanent condition (*sthāyī bhāvō*) itself becomes Rasa, "taste," when it is raised into consciousness by the *vibhāvas*, etc., so that the percipient becomes aware of its existence in himself. And why translate *sattvika* by "involuntary" when it obviously means "expressive of sincere feeling"? Again, he renders iv, 2a, "A Determinant (*vibhāva*) is that which causes the development of the States by its being recognized": but the meaning is that a *Vibhāva* causes a "State" of which the percipient was previously unconscious to become an object of his consciousness. To take another instance, he renders iv, 5, *sukhaduḥkṣādikaḥ bhāvaḥ tadbhāvabhāvanam*, by "a State (*bhāva*), [which is brought about] by emotional

states such as pleasure and pain is the realization of such states', which effectually obscures Dhanapaya's meaning viz. that a Bhava is the process in which by means of conditions such as pleasure and pain (represented by an actor etc.) the perceptive's soul is inspired with the sentiment of those conditions. Lastly we note that in the concluding stanza he renders *adhammānanda* *adhammānanda* as 'the cause of [the production of literary productions of interest to the discerning] it may imply 'a cause of the production of delight to the mind of the learned'. Altogether we venture to think that while the courage of Mr. Havis in entering the domain of the pandit is to be admired the success of his incursion would have been greater if he had provided himself with more of the pandit's technical knowledge.

L. D. KARNEY

BRUCHSTÜCKE BUDDHISTISCHER DRAMEN, herausgegeben  
von HEINRICH LÜDERN. (Königlich-Preussische  
Turfan-Expeditionen. Kleiner Sanskrit- u.  
Heft 1.) 4to. Berlin: G. Reimer, 1911.

The modest title of this book notwithstanding, Professor Lüderu has given us a work of high importance. The palm-leaf fragments which he has fitted together and transcribed with infinite patience and edited with scholarly elaboration form part of the treasures found by Dr. von Le Coq in a temple at Ming-ou and come from a manuscript brought thither from India. There are about 144 of these precious morsels of literature and together they make up a considerable portion of two Sanskrit Prakrit plays, which are *the oldest specimens of the Indian drama that have survived*. Their age is attested by the character of the writing which is identical with that of the inscriptions of the Northern Kshatrapas and Kushans. Now a colophon of one of these plays

from another MS. has been discovered by Professor Liders and edited by him in the *Sitzungsberichte der kgl. preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* for 1911 (pts. xvii-xix, pp. 388 ff.) from which we learn that the title of this drama is *Saradvati-putra-prakarana* and the author no less a personage than the famous *Asva ghosha* for whose date we may accordingly fix as lowest possible limit the first century A.D. If we adopt the chronology of Dr. Fleet and Mr. Kennedy for the Northern Kshatrapas and Kushans we may assign the period of *Asva ghosha* c. 50 B.C. and this fact strikingly confirms the Buddhist traditions which connect him with Kanishka.

To return to the dramas we find that the first is an allegorical play similar in several respects to *Krishna Misra's* well known *Prabodha-chandrodaya*, with *Buddhi Dhriti* and *Kirti* as well as the *Buddha* appearing as characters to inculcate the moral lessons of Buddhism. The second play likewise Buddhist in its teaching is more human and interesting in its method. The hero is apparently a monk, and the *Buddha*, *Sariputra*, *Maudgalyayana*, and *Kaundinya* appear as characters besides several less exalted personages. In the language also there are some interesting features. While the higher characters speak *Sanskrit* (not always quite correctly), the language of the lower personages is *Prakrit*. This is also the rule of the classical drama. But here we find two remarkable points of difference. The stage directions are in the language used by the character to whom they refer, i.e. either in *Sanskrit* or in *Prakrit*. And the *Prakrit* belongs to three dialects, *Māgadhi*, *Arīha-māgadhi*, and *Śauraseni*, all of them in stages earlier than those which are stereotyped in the works of the classical dramatists and the theoreticians who laid down the canons of dramaturgy on the basis of the latter.

These observations will suffice to indicate the capital importance of these fragments as regards both the history

of Indian literature and the development of classical technique. Professor Laiders deserves congratulations on the good fortune which brought them to him and the scholarly skill with which he has treated them.

L. D. BARNETT.

ETHISCHE PROBLEME AUS DEM "MAHABHARATA" By  
OTTO STRAUSS. Florence, 1912.

Dr. Strauss, who co-operated with Professor Deussen in the valuable translation of *Vier philosophische Texte des Mahābhārata*, in his new work, which forms an extract from vol. xxv of the Journal of the Italian Asiatic Society, has collected the main ethical doctrines of the great epic. Recognizing the difficulties attending either a philosophic arrangement of topics or a mere summary of texts, he has tried to select some leading topics and to illustrate them fully by giving the important passages in some detail with all their inconsistencies. Undoubtedly he is right in adopting this plan of action, and his work, carefully carried out and based on elaborate studies of the great epic, affords a valuable summary of the ethics of the epic which supplements excellently the important work already done by Hopkins in *The Great Epic of India* and elsewhere.<sup>1</sup>

The *Mahābhārata* is essentially in ethics a reflex of various influences and the repository of much popular philosophy and of philosophic doctrines remodelled to meet popular feeling. There is on the one hand the strict doctrine of Karma; the act produces its result automatically, and in one version death is immediately followed by rebirth in the shape of entrance into the Yoni. But the strict doctrine is subject to innumerable modifications; the older idea of rewards in heaven for

<sup>1</sup> e.g. JRAS. 1906, pp. 387 seqq.

goodness and punishment in hell for evil survives;<sup>1</sup> a reward is possible in this life and not merely after death in a new life; again, the action of Karman may be changed by the active intervention of a personal god, and he himself may merely act himself through Karman; or, again, he may stand beyond Karman, and he may be moved by good deeds to confer his favour on his worshipper, or he may be accessible by Bhakti, an idea which through all Indian religion is ever a potential presence, as the history of the Bhāgavatas and of Viṣṇu and Kṛṣṇa shows us. The strict doctrine of Karman leads unquestionably to pessimism on the one side and on the other it develops as ethical characteristics the indifference and passivity of the sage. From the two sides there also is derived a gentleness of disposition, the *Ahimsā* or *Mādhava* or *Ānṛāṇya* of the texts, which is also furthered by the tradition of the Ātman doctrine of the unity of all existence and the ideal of the householder. But this tendency of character is like the friendliness of Buddhism, as Oldenberg<sup>2</sup> has shown, essentially in ultimate essence selfish, in that it is done for the sake of one's own self, much as some Catholic teachers of ethics hold that e.g. towards animals the Christian has no duties, but has duties to himself as regards animals. On the other hand, as opposed to this state of Nivṛtti, the spirit of Pravṛtti lays stress on the positive side of the Karman doctrine, on the benefits of good actions, and supports a more active and positive morality. In the *Gītā* the two are found blended in the form of duty without hope of gain, where the power of Nivṛtti has not indeed banished Pravṛtti but has fundamentally modified its ethical content.

These are a few of the complex trains of ideas which

<sup>1</sup> How far this view is really independent at any time of the other it is impossible to say. Both can coexist, and that in any one passage the one is independent cannot be proved, or effectively denied.

<sup>2</sup> *Aus dem alten Indien*, pp. 1 seqq. (a criticism of Pischel's view of *manu*).

the epic presents and which Dr. Strauss patiently and clearly expounds. Of real philosophic merit there is little or nothing; of human interest there is much. It is not unsatisfactory to find that attempts were made<sup>1</sup> feebly and illogically no doubt to see a moral ground for the caste differences which are an essential feature of epic life, and the different strands of belief in the *Gita* are happily discriminated by Dr. Strauss in a way that deserves consideration even after Garbes<sup>2</sup> and Hopkins'<sup>3</sup> work on the subject. But detailed examination of that question—on which no absolute result is possible—would carry us too far, and it must be sufficient to note some minor points of interest.

It seems to me very doubtful if Dr. Strauss is right (p. 205, n. 2) in rejecting in xii, 202, 18, the version of Hopkins<sup>4</sup> of *kayam adṛśyam anyad viśāṁ śarīram*, "enters another unseen body," in favour of an adverbial sense of *adṛśyam*. Without denying the possibility of this rendering, it must be admitted that in view of the place of *adṛśyam* the sense "unseen" as applicable to body is too obvious to be passed over. On the other hand (p. 195), he seems wisely to follow Hopkins in seeing in xii, 190-2 rather an Epic Upaniṣad than a Dharmasūtra as is Deussen's<sup>5</sup> view. In iii, 32-16 the author (p. 231 n. 1) seems somewhat surprised at the use of *hott* rather than in the sense of "Zufall" than as usual of *iti*. But the seeming difference of use is hardly real; the position runs

*akasmād ita yathā kāścid artham prapadye, na ca sat  
tasya hothanti mānavaḥ sa ha yathā na 'tīśvareṇ*

The sense *akasmāt* is perfectly good here as it is in contrast

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 326-33. It is of interest to compare these efforts with the Aristotelian doctrine of slavery as only justified by the goodness of the moral superiority of the master.

<sup>2</sup> In his translation (Leipzig, 1905).

<sup>3</sup> Especially in JRA<sup>4</sup> 1905, pp. 344-9.

<sup>4</sup> *Great Epic of India*, p. 174.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 206.

<sup>6</sup> *Ally (book of Phil.)* 1. 3. 301.

is not between conscious striving (*yatna*) and accident but between conscious striving and the overpowering strength of fate.

Although in principle Dr. Strauss seems content to regard the *text* as a real synthesis of different strands of opinion rather than as a mere working over of a basis (e.g. theistic) by a new faith (e.g. pantheistic) as is Garbe's view, he seems led (p. 312 n. 1) to approve Schrader's<sup>1</sup> theory of a pre-Visnuitic *Mahabharata* by the contradiction of it, 37, where, in a work whose end is duty without reward, Kṛṣṇa is assured of heaven if he falls, earth if he conquers. Schrader holds that Garbe's theory is to be supplemented by yet an earlier stage (ending at ii, 38 of the present text or a little later) of a non-theistic, non-pantheistic *Bhagavadgita* based on the Atman doctrine of the Upanisads in a pluralistic sense, a sort of Nirīkṣara Sāṃkhya but neither he nor Dr. Strauss adduces any real evidence for this view. Neither the inconsequence of ii 37 nor the attack on the Vedas in ii 46 (if the passage is so interpreted with Pavolini against the majority of renderings) can support so serious a theory.

A. BERRIDALE KEITH

ROVEDA VII A. TEXTKRITISCHE UND EXEGETISCHE  
NOTEN. By HERMANN OLDENBERG. Berlin 1911.

The continuation of Professor Oldenberg's work on the *Rigveda* exhibits all those high qualities which were noted

<sup>1</sup> ZDMG. lxx 376-40.

<sup>2</sup> Schrader (ZDMG. lxx 363-5) has sought to show that Yajñavalkya in the *Bṛhadaranyaka Upaniṣad*, iii, 2, 13, and iv, 4, 2-6, does not teach metempsychosis. The attempt is a failure; it contradicts the Mālikiyandina text, which is perfectly clear, and it causes the author to adopt a series of alternative and improbable explanations of the words *anyājan va bhūtānām*, which naturally include men, and to deny that *atidhar bhavati* can mean "he is born again as good", though he admits it can mean "he reappears (in the world) in favourable circumstances".



in our review (JRAS. 1910, pp. 224 seqq.) of his notes on books i-vi. The editor has had no reason to alter the fundamental principles on which his work is based, and the few changes which he has introduced, such as the writing of *tanûra* for *tanûti*, are unquestionably improvements. It is only, therefore, necessary to note a few of the many important points in which he adds to our knowledge of the *Saṃhitā*.

Professor Oldenberg refuses to find in the *Rgveda* the doctrine of metempsychosis, whether in its direct expression or presupposed in the view of the pre-existence of the soul. He rejects Geldner's<sup>1</sup> theory of the pre-existence of Vasistha's soul in vii. 33. 9, and his<sup>2</sup> reading of Samsāra into x. 14. 2, and he agrees with me<sup>3</sup> in rejecting Boyer<sup>4</sup> and Windisch's<sup>5</sup> discovery of it in x. 14. 14. The conclusion thus rendered inevitable is that metempsychosis is not Rgyedic, a fact which sets a very wide gulf between the early and the later Vedic world.

In x. 55. 3, the editor suggests that we find the earliest mention of the Naksatras as twenty-seven making up the thirty-four lights with the sun, the moon, the five planets, and this view of Ludwig's is also accepted by Griffith in his translation. But is it possible to rear any structure involving the decision in the affirmative as to the existence of both the Naksatras and the planets on so slender a basis as a modern conjecture (Śāyana has it not) as to the meaning of a vague phrase giving the number thirty-four, a number which is very possibly merely suggested by thirty-five in the preceding line, and so is purely artificial? Oldenberg<sup>6</sup> elsewhere has expressed the view that twenty-seven is the early Indian number, but he relies on the citation of passages by Weber,<sup>7</sup> and Weber

<sup>1</sup> *Vedische Studien*, ii. 142.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 298, 299. Cf. my note, ZDMG. lxxv. 347.

<sup>3</sup> JRAS. 1910, p. 215.

<sup>4</sup> *Journal Asiatique*, 1901, ii. 484.

<sup>5</sup> GGA. 1909, p. 351.

<sup>6</sup> *Buddha's Teaching*, p. 338.

<sup>7</sup> *Numism.* ii. 278 seqq.

could not in 1861 use the *Maitrayani Samhitā*. That text (ii, 13, 20) has twenty-eight, including the suspect Abhijit and the deity Brahman as personal, and its evidence must be set against the silence of the *Taittiriya* and the *Kāthaka* lists, so that the question of the number cannot be lightly disposed of. It is true that Brahman who makes thus his first appearance for certain<sup>1</sup> in the Vedic texts, is not primitive, but this fact is in harmony with the view that the series of the Naksatras is a post-Rgvedic introduction from some foreign source. The idea that the Naksatras are again referred to in x, 138, 5 is very far from convincing. Again the Rgvedic evidence for the planets is surely very weak. Ludwig, indeed, has already seduced Professor Oldenberg into seeing a reference to them in i, 105, 16, though elsewhere<sup>2</sup> he emphasizes the doubtful character of the Vedic evidence for knowledge of the planets. Whitney<sup>3</sup> was of opinion that no hint of the existence of planets can be found in the *Rgveda*, and the further alleged cases since adduced by scholars rest on the most unsatisfactory foundations.<sup>4</sup>

Unfortunately Charpentier's article<sup>5</sup> on viii, 100, appeared too late to be criticized. In that article Charpentier seeks to solve the hymn by the aid of *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa* (iii, 2, 4, 1-6) instead of by the aid of iv, 1, 3, 1 seqq., as does Oldenberg. I regret that Charpentier's version satisfies me as little as did<sup>6</sup> Oldenberg's, and it seems to me that this is one of those cases where the riddle of the hymn can never be solved by the instruments at our command. Charpentier,

<sup>1</sup> He is probably found in *Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa*, ii, 2, 17, 1 (not an early Mantra) and certainly in the late chapter vii, 9, 1, of the *Maitrayani Samhitā*. But not in *Rgveda*, x, 141, 2, which Weber (*Über den Vajapeya*, p. 37, n. 2) regards as possible; the *ca* practically forbids this.

<sup>2</sup> *GAIA*, 1900, p. 568.

<sup>3</sup> *JAOS*, xvi, p. lxxxviii.

<sup>4</sup> See Macdonell & Keith, *Vedic Index*, i, 241-2.

<sup>5</sup> *VQJ*, xxy, 290-310.

<sup>6</sup> See *JRAI*, 1911, pp. 992 seqq.

indeed, by inversion of vv. 6 and 12, and by supplying a new set of *dramatis personæ*, including the bird-form of Viṣṇu, makes a sort of sense out of the hymn, but Oldenberg accomplished the same in a totally different way, and, as both use the same method, the legitimate conclusion is that the method is fundamentally imperfect. Charpentier,<sup>1</sup> however, rightly rejects the Ākhyāna theory on the ground of its needlessness to explain the facts.

On the question of the Tṛtsus, Oldenberg has a brief appendix<sup>2</sup> in which he controverts Geldner's theory of the name as that of the royal family of the Bharatas, and not of the priestly Vasisthas.<sup>3</sup> The facts are admittedly hard to decide, for in vii, 83 the name appears to mean the priests, in 18 and 33 a people. It is impossible to assert positively that either Geldner or Oldenberg is right; in favour of Geldner's view, however, must be set the phrase, vii, 33, 6, *Tṛtsūnām viśāḥ*, which naturally means "subjects of the Tṛtsus" rather than "people connected with the Tṛtsus", and perhaps more distinctly the words in vii, 33, 14, *ā ro gachoti Pratrdo Vasisthah*, where it is hardly possible to doubt Sāyana's view that the Pratrds are the Tṛtsus. When Oldenberg says that more than Sāyana's authority is needed for this purpose has he overlooked Geldner's legitimate argument from the name Prataradum Daivodāsi? That the priests should in vii, 83, 8 be called Tṛtsus is surely not at all impossible, when they are conceived as securing the victory of the head of the royal house which they served. In later times the reverse process would be more likely, but the *Rgyeda* is, as Oldenberg himself has often shown, not on the same level as the later texts. Nor am I sure that he is right in refusing to accept Hopkins'<sup>4</sup> view that Viśvāmitra is aimed at in vii, 18, and in denying the reality of the conflict of Vasistha and Viśvāmitra for

<sup>1</sup> VOJ. xzv, 308-10.

<sup>2</sup> *Pedische Studien*, ii, 136 seqq.

<sup>3</sup> pp. 14-15.

<sup>4</sup> JAOS, xv, 200 seqq.

the *Rgveda*. Certainty indeed is impossible, but the hypothesis is clearly the natural inference from all the texts, and Geldner's hint that vii, 103. 10*d* is a reference to iii, 53. 7*d* is attractive, though Oldenberg rejects it also. On the other hand, Oldenberg seems to me right in rejecting the ingenious theory of Bloomfield<sup>1</sup> of the existence of a people or place Ambara (viii, 8. 16 : i, 47. 7).

These instances must suffice to show the extraordinary variety of interest in this great commentary, and I shall conclude with a reference to the appendices on *tura* (p. 25), on the relation of Usas and Sūrya (p. 53), and on the apparent cases of contraction over *u* (pp. 69, 79), all models of convincing argument.

A. BERREDALE KEITH.

BUDDHISM: A STUDY OF THE BUDDHIST NORM. By Mrs. RHYs DAVIDS, M.A. The Home University Library of Modern Knowledge.

Buddhist studies might be called a large province fifty years ago: and the frontiers have been carried outwards by a series of annexations. For some of the latest of these we have to thank the archaeological services of the European Governments presiding over India, Further India, and Indo-China, and the collective work of Indianists and Sinologues on Central Asian documents. In the meantime knowledge of the literature of China, Japan, and Tibet advances year by year. Therefore, if a work pledged to be both small and instructive would bear the name *Buddhism* without reproach, only one aspect of this vast subject can be chosen by the writer, and the reader must be warned that he is reading of only one.

Mrs. Rhys Davids—whose appearance in the Home University Library is most welcome—makes her choice

<sup>1</sup> JAOS. xxxi, 52 seq.

as those who have studied her other valuable works would expect. She selects for treatment the philosophical and moral aspect of the old-school Buddhism of the Pali Sutta- and Abhidhamma-piṭakas. She illustrates her explanation of these with a telling choice of passages from the older texts. Other sources are drawn upon to illustrate some later phases, to show how the Theravāda doctrine was handled, after the fixing of the canon, in a free picturesque, and captivating exposition, in the Milinda-panha, and later still, developed in more scholastic style by the learned Buddhaghosa. Mrs. Rhys Davids does not fail to make it clear that some differences of period are to be taken into consideration in following the authorities on which her study of Theravāda Buddhism is based. By this precaution she will save the inexperienced reader of translations from some pitfalls.

Buddhaghosa is her strong ally. Buddhaghosa tempts some of us to endless idle reading of his charming romances and long digressions on life religious and secular. But the writer of *Buddhism* studying his earliest commentary (*Athasālinī*) found that the great commentator was a notable psychologist. The Abhidhamma text *Dhammasaṅgī* afforded him no opportunity for anecdote but much for analysis of human feeling and mental processes and he proved that the study of the latest piṭaka could be fruitful. According to Buddhaghosa (says Mrs. Rhys Davids) the Abhidhamma was 'enlulated to check those excesses in thought away from the Norm which were shown by the Buddha to lead to loss of mental balance, craziness, insanity' (p. 30). The end was certainly good, the means chosen by some of the early Abhidhammikas to attain that end are rather distressing to the novice. But when Buddhaghosa takes the texts in hand we feel ourselves on safer ground. Besides, the history of Buddhism in Burma shows how firmly the Theravāda Buddhists of that country, even

more than those of Ceylon, attached themselves to the Abhidhamma; therefore a complete knowledge of this ancient school of Buddhism supposes a careful study of the third great section of its canon. Mrs. Rhys Davids has not shirked the task of bringing it within our reach. Her "Buddhist Psychology" editions of canonical Abhidhamma texts and the twelfth century Abhidhammattha-saṅgaha (translated in collaboration with Mr. S. Z. Aung) are in themselves an important chapter of modern Buddhist studies.

Arising partly from these special researches the present work shapes itself naturally around certain main points of which one is thus stated (p. 64). For Buddhist thought from the start, psychological insight is an integral part of philosophical and of religious insight. It started not with the external universe and its first or final cause but with the heart of man sentient and desiring. In this fathom long conscious *beheaded* body I declare the world to be and the uprising of the world and the ceasing of the world and the course leading to that cessation. Training in mental analysis was considered essential both as ethical discipline and as clearing the way for sound philosophy.

Few subjects would appear at first sight, less easy to adapt for uninitiated readers. But Mrs. Rhys Davids has had the courage to take Theravāda thought as first-hand research has shown it to her. She judges rightly that to adapt even the unexpected and difficult too much would be to falsify the character of the old system. The first chapter introduces the Pali tradition to the reader in a (necessarily brief) explanation of its difference from the other Buddhist traditions, and a sketch of the earlier fortunes of Buddhism. Incidentally the author seems to deplore the religious achievements of Aśoka: "no creed needed so much as Buddhism to be left severely alone by political patronage." What would the author of

the old Mahāvamsa say to this? He thought kings very useful sometimes. No doubt there were theras, the most conservative of the ancients, who looked unfavourably on Aśoka's managing zeal. But it is not sure that we should have a Pali canon to study in our day if the secular arm had withheld its aid altogether.

However, this is only a small point. The principal theme of the book is the Norm (the Dhamma), and its great interest lies in the writer's most able discussion of that subject. As far as limited space allows she outlines the beliefs or speculations prevailing at the time of the rise of Buddhism, and partly revealed to us by discussions occurring in the Pitakas and their commentaries. Naturally it was impossible to enlighten readers much on the Upanishads or on the Sāṅkhya and the Yoga systems within the limits fixed, but some essential points are dwelt upon. Some stress is laid on the character of Buddhism in contrast to contemporary systems. We see it first as a reaction against the "overwrought metaphysical speculation of the age", especially the Brahmanic doctrine of the Absolute (known to us in the Upanishads). Secondly, the theory of causation, a vital doctrine in Buddhism, was "a protest against a certain variety of scepticism current at the time". Probably, as Mrs. Rhys Davids observes, this scepticism was a "more extreme recoil" than Buddhism itself from Absolutist beliefs. The Nihilists of the Buddha's time are said to have refused to recognize "any human energy or power that is effective". Another school taught "that there was no fruit or result of good or evil deeds", and so forth. The saying of the Buddha given here as his gospel, his central doctrine or Dhamma, in answer to a Jain and against the speculations then rife, is a short passage of the Majjhima Nikāya (Sutta 79): "I will teach you the Dhamma: 'that being present, this becomes; from the arising of that, this arises. That being absent, this does

not become ; from the cessation of that, this ceases ' ' (p. 89). From this point Mrs. Rhys Davids grapples with the question of the "chain or wheel of the twelve bases", giving the explanations of the commentators for each of the twelve links, and in discussing the wheel she defends the position which she holds to be more truly Buddhist than the tendency to give "the fact of Ill" the chief place in the doctrine. In her own words (p. 92): "The prominence given in the doctrine to this fact of Ill or the ills of life, and the accounting for those ills in the foregoing formula by a string of natural causes, have proved for students of the doctrine the supreme, nay, the only interesting features in it. The emphasis on the general method or point of view as illustrated by this stock genealogy of Ill is relatively passed over.

"Now a comparative study of the many contexts of the formula, in the Pitakas, may show that the general principle involved, namely, natural causation, was at least as important as the classic illustration and application of the principle."

This argument is very attractive and has (like all views advanced here and elsewhere by the same writer) a good base of texts to stand upon. It is well said too (p. 97): "*The fact of suffering does not come as a revelation to the Buddha, thinking hard beneath his Bodhi-tree, nor the fairly obvious causes of it. That fact drove him restless from home, station, and ease. It was the process of the natural, necessary, universal law by which all things, bodily and mental, happened or became nascent, static, and expiring.*" This is, no doubt, too often overlooked, and one of the greatest claims of Buddhist thought is worthily defended by the writer in many other passages. Nevertheless there exist in the old Pali texts, and in this very story of the enlightenment and the first preaching of the Dhamma, some other elements that were destined to pass into the Buddhism of all the Buddhist world and to hold



## NOTICES OF BOOKS

the dominant place while the schools separated one from another in wide doctrinal differences. There is therefore some justification for the more obvious and usual view, i.e. that the recognition of universal sorrow and the way to end it first and last of the "Four truths", are the chief points in the teaching of an all knowing and compassionate Buddha. And these have been, in fact, of supreme interest to believing Buddhists since the days of the discourse in the Deerpark. Still, even readers but little versed in the subject are hardly likely to take the *Dhamma* to be the whole of Buddhism, and if any should it will not be Mrs. Rhys Davids' fault. Her theme is clearly marked out in the closing words of the introduction. My aim here is not to controvert but only to expound a few salient philosophical standpoints which whether they be derived or original, are involved in the ethical views and methods advocated in the Pali canon."

The discussion is continued in chapters iv and v on the Norm as law of causation and the Norm as moral law. The three principal chapters are developed from a passage in Buddhaghosa explaining the four meanings of the word *dhamma*. That passage is quoted by Mrs Rhys Davids (p. 49) as containing "the whole of Theravada Buddhist philosophy in a nutshell". Incidentally some of the modern notions on Buddhism prevailing in the outside world are met and corrected. These chapters, the fruit of long study and pondering on the Pali texts might well be expanded into a larger book.

*Buddhism* is literally packed with thought and learning, but this very abundance leads sometimes in the earlier chapters, to a terseness which comes near obscurity. It may be impossible to give many pages to preliminary matter in so short an account of a particular philosophy, but more repetitions and a little more amplification would have made some paragraphs much clearer. Still, the needs

of the general reader have certainly been present to the writer's mind as a rule and many difficult Buddhist terms are discussed with full allowance for their difficulty. Instances are: *atta*, *karma*, *jhāna*, *dukkha*, *nibbāna*. There is also frequent comparison of Buddhist with Western philosophy and psychology and explanation of certain Buddhist ideas which can be most easily misinterpreted, half translated by Western equivalents in speech or confused with the thoughts underlying the language of Christianity.

*Buddhism* could not, and evidently its author did not intend that it should, be only a statement of the intellectual standpoint given in the Pali Sutta and Abhidhamma. A plain and even statement entirely on those lines would have made the little volume a useful text-book perhaps lacking in colour and persuasiveness. But Mrs. Rhys Davids has added to her explanation of the Theravada philosophy a description and eloquent praise of the early Buddhist ideal. This side of the matter is important to the reader wishing not only to understand the ideal of the past but the force of some currents of modern feeling and belief. The chapter on the Buddhist ideal leads to the 'quest' where the writer returns to a subject on which she was heard some little time ago. Profoundly in sympathy with the early Buddhists, living for years, so to speak, with the Sisters in the Thert-gāthā, the writer of *Buddhism* has traced in their utterances - and still more in those of the Brethren - much beside weariness of the world and the still joy of meditation. She tells us and was the first to tell us, of their love of nature. She gleans with care the few small earthly flowers that the compilers of the ancient book of stanzas left as they went their way, meditating on impermanence. These blossoms have the more charm in contrast with the miraculous and celestial decoration of some scenes in the Tipitaka, prose and verse. The quotations here

are aptly chosen as illustration and very gracefully rendered.

A word or two more must end these few notes, which, having no pretension to be "criticism", may, however, serve as a reference to some points in the book and as an occasion to express hearty admiration. To conclude, one observation: the bibliography given at the end might, and should, have been more comprehensive. In this connexion it would be a good thing, or rather it is a duty, to say something about the possible new recruits that such a book may bring to Buddhist scholarship. Those of us who are pledged to the service of the Pali language have the most reason to pray that Pali and Sanskrit studies may prosper in a close alliance. A separation must always be doubly unfortunate for Pali. In order that Pali may keep its deserved place in Indian philology intending students must know the great importance of Sanskrit for Palists and Sanskritists should support and encourage the study of Pali language and literature. The study of both together should not languish here where the means of knowing it are abundant.

The new generation of Pali students has much to be thankful for: most of the Tipitaka ready to its hand in the Pali Text Society's editions and enough of the later works to illustrate the development of the language besides an array of Sanskrit texts irreproachably edited, next plenty of inscriptions, lastly plenty of translations. Good students will work the better if much is demanded of them, and it is to be hoped that some will set themselves with a hearty goodwill to Pali and Sanskrit both that some may be equipped beforehand with classical scholarship like Mrs. Rhys Davids and some, if not all, prove to be gifted with her admirable energy and patience. Our debt to her is increased now, but before the publication of the present work she had given liberal help, as many besides

Palists know, to pilgrims in an unfamiliar world of thought. Meanwhile, as a scholar, she has literally never ceased from toil in the cause of Pali and Buddhist philosophy.

M. H. BODE.

**THE JOURNAL OF THE BURMA RESEARCH SOCIETY.** Vol. I, Parts I and II; Vol. II, Part I. Rangoon, 1911, 1912.

In general, I venture to think, the appearance in the field of Oriental research of a new periodical is rather a doubtful blessing. We already have more than we can find time to keep in touch with even though the *Orientalische Bibliographie* helps us to feel our way amongst them. But in the present case I am convinced that everyone interested in Indo-China and the Far East at any rate will give a hearty welcome to a new publication which was sorely needed. Burma is by far the least explored of the Indian provinces, by far the most complex from the point of view of ethnology and linguistics and it yields to none in wealth of interest or variety of subjects suitable for research. For years this province has been literally waiting for the formation of a society to stimulate inquiry into matters of local interest. It was no particular credit to the resident community that it had to wait so long. The little colony to the southward with which I formerly had the honour to be connected has had such a society for more than thirty years past and its records testify to the good work it has done. It was high time for Burma to follow (and if possible improve on) such a worthy lead.

The Burma Research Society has now been in existence for more than two years, and has issued three numbers of its Journal. I understand that a list of the principal contents of these numbers will appear on another page of this Journal, and I therefore confine myself to a brief

## NOTICES OF BOOKS

mention of a few articles that have struck me as being particularly interesting or important. Mr. J. S. Furnivall's paper on Matriarchal Vestiges in Burma seems to me very suggestive but somewhat inconclusive; the subject has need to be further investigated, but the facts he brings forward are of great interest, whether we regard them as proving his thesis or not. A rather gruesome account by Mr. G. E. B. Grant Brown of Human Sacrifices near the Upper Chinlwin illustrates the wide range from barbarism to civilization which is so eminently a characteristic of the provinces of Burma. The Rev. C. B. Antisdell contributes some valuable linguistic notes on Lahoo, Ahka, and Wa. Lahoo and Karen traditions also have papers devoted to them, and the most recent number contains an English version of a Lahoo poem on the Hunt for the Beeswax which is truly remarkable, both for its primitive structure and its descriptive power and touches of imagination. I can only express my regret that the translator, Mr. Ba Te, has not seen fit to supply us with the original text as well. I trust this omission will be made good later on. We need texts of little-known languages and can hardly have too many of them.

In part ii of vol. i Mr. Taw Sein Ko has a somewhat controversial article on Chinese Antiquities at Pagan: while fully prepared to believe in the reality of Chinese influence on Burma at certain periods of her history, I for one am not ready to accept all the conclusions which Mr. Taw Sein Ko draws from the ascertained facts until the case has been made much clearer. There is a very curious and interesting article in part i of vol. ii entitled Hypnotism in Burma, though it deals with a considerable variety of "occult" and more or less unexplained phenomena.<sup>2</sup> This is by Maung Shwe Zan Aung, and in this connexion I may perhaps be permitted to remark that it is one of the most satisfactory features of the new society and its journal that natives of the

province are taking a large share in both, and are thus exhibiting in this new field of work the cordiality so happily prevalent in the relations of Europeans and Asiatics in Burma.

There are many other articles of interest besides those that I have referred to and the short notes and reviews of publications contain much that is valuable. The new journal owes a great deal to its Honorary Editor, Professor C. Duroiselle. I can only express the hope that this auspicious beginning will be followed by permanent success. There seems to be no reason why it should not.

C. O. BLAGDEN

REINWARD BRANDSTETTER'S MONOGRAPHIEN ZUR INDONESISCHEN SPRACHFORSCHUNG. IX. DAS VERBUM DARGESTELLT ALS GRUND EINER ANALYSE DER BESTEN TEXTE IN VIERUNDZWANZIG INDONESISCHEN SPRACHEN. Laizer Buchhandlung Haag 1912

We have here yet another monograph of Dr Brandstetter's and it maintains the high standard he has set himself. After a first chapter devoted to the explanation of his method and an account of the materials on which his study is based, he gives us a succession of chapters on the simple (or uncompounded) verb, the verbal formatives, the three kinds of verbs characteristic of Indonesian languages in general, the modes, the tenses, the persons, and two chapters on different aspects of syntax in relation to the verb. Inevitably other parts of speech are involved in the discussion of these matters, and, in fact, we get in chapter vii a very valuable dissertation on the personal pronouns which in some of the Indonesian languages, appear in duplicate or even in triplicate, different forms being appropriated to different functions. It is interesting to note that in Rotinese there is actually an incipient conjugational inflection, the abbreviated forms of the

personal pronouns being welded on to the verb in much the same way as in the older forms of the Indo-European languages, save that in Rottinese the pronoun is put first, not last.

One fundamental difficulty underlying the whole subject of the monograph under review is the question as to what, in the Indonesian languages may be called a verb. That is a point on which there has been extreme divergence of opinion. Some little while ago I came across an article whereof the thesis appeared to be that Malay at least possesses hardly any, if any, verbs at all. And some Dutch scholars, without going to such lengths as these, have solemnly averred that all the intransitive verbs in the Malay language are really adjectives. The reason of all this trouble is that most Indonesian languages are devoid of or at any rate habitually dispense with a copula. Consequently an adjective can be attached periphrastically to a subject just as though it were a verb. This does a good deal to obliterate the distinction between the two. Further, as the typical Indonesian verb does not necessarily modify its form to indicate differences of tense and person and is often used participially, well I must admit that it is not easy to draw a hard and fast line. Dr Braadstreet outflanks rather than meets the difficulty by regarding as verbal stems all those that indicate action or are affected on or condition. But I have no wish to enter into a discussion on these thorny matters at present and can only refer the reader to the work itself for a restatement of the author's position.

Another point of general interest is the fact that some at least of the verbal formatives appear to have been originally separate parts of speech, namely prepositions or articles. *A priori*<sup>2</sup> that was to be expected, but it is satisfactory that in certain cases our reasonable anticipations should be confirmed by the evidence. Perhaps the most interesting of the identifications given

## CATALOGUE OF INDONESIAN MSS.

by Dr. Brandstetter is that of the widespread formative *a* with the article *a*. Connected with this, too, is his ingenious explanation of the well-known assimilation that takes place between the formative *a*, even when preceded by another formative, such as *ma*, and the initial consonant of the verb stem; he regards it as the result of analogy with the cases where *a* is prefixed by itself to a stem with a consonantal initial. As a double initial consonant is in general repugnant to the Indonesian phonetic system, some simplification was often inevitable, and this was then extended to cases where there was no such necessity.

As in all Dr. Brandstetter's works there is in this little monograph a great deal of learning. It is no small matter to have collected so many apt illustrations from actual texts in twenty-four different languages. This implies not merely patient toil but also an extraordinary capacity for mastering a large quantity of very diverse material. Besides these qualifications Dr. Brandstetter also possesses a thorough grasp of scientific method and a rare gift of lucidity in exposition, and these valuable characteristics are traceable in every page of his latest work.

C. O. BLADEN

SUPPLEMENT OP DEN CATALOGUS VAN DE JAVAANSCH-  
EN MALAYEESCHE HANDSCHRIFTEN DER LEIDSCHE  
UNIVERSITEITS BIBLIOTHEEK. Deel II. Nieuw-  
javaansche Gedichten en Oud-, Middel-, en Nieuw-  
javaansche Prozaschrijft. Door Dr. H. H. J. J. J. J.  
SUPPLEMENT OP DEN CATALOGUS VAN DE SUNDANEESCHE  
HANDSCHRIFTEN EN CATALOGUS VAN DE BALINEESCHE  
EN SASAKESCHE HANDSCHRIFTEN DER LEIDSCHE  
UNIVERSITEITS BIBLIOTHEEK. Door Dr. H. H.  
J. J. J. J.

Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1911 and 1912 respectively.

The University of Leyden is in the way of accumulating a very fine library of Indonesian MSS. Besides its Malay



and Javanese collections it now possesses a number of MSS. in Sundanese (the language of Western Java), Madurese, Balinese, and Sasak (the native language of Lombok), as enumerated in these catalogues and the previous ones to which they are supplementary. The MSS. seem to be mostly in the Javanese character, or its archaic variant the Balinese, but some are in the Arabic script and a few in the Roman. The sources from which they are ultimately derived, so far as they are not purely native, are partly Muhammadan and partly Hindu. It will be remembered that these races were under Indian influence for a considerable time before Islam became established amongst them and supplanted the Brahmanism and Mahayanist Buddhism which formerly prevailed. In Bali, as is well known these older religions still maintain themselves though in a more or less modified or corrupted form for Bali was the refuge where the fugitive Hindus of Java managed to concentrate their forces and Muhammadanism never succeeded in gaining any footing there. Both poetry and prose are represented in these collections but the latter somewhat predominates. It is to be noted that the first above-named volume contains (apart from a short appendix) only Javanese works yet it is more than double the size of the other two thus illustrating the greater relative importance of the Javanese literature. Both volumes are furnished with the necessary indexes and also with sets of lists of the works catalogued both in the native character and the Roman.

C. C. BRADY

#### SOME RECENT ARABIC LITERATURE

Abu Hanifah al Dinawari. *Kitab al aghar al amsal* preface, variants et index. Leyden Brill 1912. The Chronicle of Abu Hanifah al-Dinawari was published in

1888 by V. Guirgass; a reprint of this chronicle by a Cairene publisher is announced in the *Muṭabbaṭ* for July of this year. M. Ignace Kratchkovsky, of St. Petersburg, has accomplished the useful task of providing Guirgass's edition with the needful indices and variants, and has besides added a careful preface, utilizing such material as was procurable for the biography of Abū Ḥanīfah. This chronicle is of value especially for the early relations of Moslems with Persia: the Russian scholar's service deserves our gratitude.

*Monuments of Arabic Philology*, by Paul Brûnle, vols. i and ii. commentary on Ibn Hisham's Biography of Muhammad: F. Diemer, Cairo, 1911. These volumes constitute the first of a series of editions to be issued by Dr. Brûnle under the high patronage of the German Emperor and the King of Württemberg. Dr. Brûnle has selected grammatical texts, of which the first is the gloss of Abū Dharr al Khushani on the familiar Biography of Muhammad edited by Wustenfeld, and afterwards reprinted at Zubair Pasha's expense. A commentary by an author of the sixth century A.H. on one of the second may or may not be valuable: that depends on the nature of his sources and whether he had any which are not now accessible to us. Doubtless in the "European Edition", which is to follow, Dr. Brûnle will tell us what is necessary on this matter; to the present writer the commentary seems poor stuff. We may glance at the notes (p. 149) on a poem ascribed to Abū Bakr (in Wustenfeld's edition, p. 417)--

هروا . معناد وثبوا كما شب الكلاب "leaps as dogs leap."

This is certainly erroneous; the word means "whine".

المجاهرات . يعني الكلاب التي احجرت و'جنت الى مواضعها  
 "He means the dogs that have been . . . and forced to  
 their places."

Clearly what is intended is مجاهرات, as the text of

Wüstenfeld has the word, but the gloss is evidently erroneous as is shown by the verse in the *Amali* of Kāh App 11

وانع المعرة للمعرة ذدت شعوه محجود نسج الدسج

The dogs are not driven to their lairs, but drive other animals to theirs.

وانع المتصلا اي متتنا. "have connected ourselves." The correct gloss is *توصلنا*, "appeal."

اي غير محزن. "not vexing." The correct gloss is "such as cause him no concern".

اي نسرع. "hasten." This means a reading *نجدى*, which is no improvement.

The other pages which the reviewer has consulted appear to be no better; but appearances are deceptive, and we must wait for the European edition before we can definitely state that Dr. Bromle might have employed his time more profitably than in editing this work.

*Reise des Arabers Ibn Batuta durch Indien und China* bearbeitet von Dr. Hans von Mäik, Hamburg, Gutenberg-Verlag, 1911. This is a German translation of the Travels of Ibn Batuta in India and China which occupy from iii, 93 to ix, 310 in the edition of his work by Defrémery & Sanguinetti. It contains a useful introduction and index, one or two maps and a few geographical and chronological notes. The translation itself commences somewhat unspectacularly with the rendering of *أول ما وقع في بلاد الهند* by *mandet in der heissen Zone* which appears to be absolutely impossible for "overflows in the hot season" which is the context requires, and in general where the German renderings differ from the French the latter are to be preferred. Some examples may be cited, showing the difficulty of rendering these texts. Defrémery in 349 Mäik, p. 211, the author is presented with ten captive Hindu girls. He

فأعصت لردى حاء من واحد من معارضى ذنب  
 the French rendering is je donnai une de ces filles  
 esclaves à celui qui me les amena et il ne fut pas  
 satisfait. The German rendering is ich gab demjenigen  
 der sie brachte eine davon, doch hatte er keinen Gefallen  
 daran. The correct rendering is 'I offered the man who  
 brought them one of them, but he declined'. The next  
 sentence runs والسبي هنالك رخيص الثمن لأنهن قذرات لا يعرفن  
 مصانع العظم, which is rendered in German "die kriegs-  
 gefangenen Frauen sind hier wohlfeil zu haben denn sie  
 sind schmutzig und wissen nichts von den Umgangsformen  
 der Stadtbewohner". There follows: والمعلمات رخصات  
 والسبي هنالك رخيص الثمن لأنهن قذرات لا يعرفن  
 مصانع العظم rendered solltet die besser  
 unterrichteten stehn billig im Preise, niemand ist darauf  
 angewiesen sich kriegsgefangene Frauen zu kaufen". This  
 is very clearly a *non sequitur*, if the 'better instructed'  
 are among the captives the conclusion must be "so no one  
 needs to buy the uneducated". What the author means,  
 then is "Moslem women are low in price" for even the  
 free woman has an assessment in Moslem law "whence  
 no one need buy a captive". It is probable but not  
 perhaps certain that we should read 'مسميات'. The  
 rendering of the preceding clause may be intentionally  
 euphemistic and should not be assailed, yet an  
 archaeological note (possibly in Latin) would have been  
 desirable.

The next sentence runs والكنار بلاد الهند في برمنيل وبلاد  
 مستنمة مع المسلمين والمسلمون شامون عليهم  
 Heiden in Indien bewohnen ein geschlossenes Gebiet und  
 Bezirke welche an die der Muslime grenzen welche jene  
 besiegt haben". The true meaning appears to be "the  
 heathen in India live with the Moslems in contiguous  
 fields and towns, only the Moslems are the dominant  
 community".

Hence the praise which can be given to some translations, though not many, that they render further consultation of the original unnecessary, cannot be assigned to this: nevertheless, it marks some advance in the study of Ibn Batuta.

The *Sulām* Press of Buenos Ayres, in addition to its bi-weekly journal which always devotes much attention to the affairs of Syria and the Ottoman Empire, has recently published a series of works in Arabic chiefly for the use of the Syrian community in Argentina. The *Guia Asilam*, with Arabic title دليل السلام, contains statistics of great interest and other matter dealing with the immigration and the immigrants. The number of Syrians who came to reside in Argentina in 1890 was 210, in 1891 twenty-one; the figures increased slowly until 1897, since when they have gone up by leaps and bounds: the figure for 1909 was 11,765 gross and 10,137 net. The net total for twenty years comes to 51,223. Of these the greater number are employed in trade but agriculture is also represented. A companion volume is a history of Argentina, تاريخ الأرجنتين, by Wadi Shum'un, proprietor of the journal *Sulām*. The same office has also issued a Spanish Arabic Vocabulary. It would seem that the proportion of the immigrants that returns to Syria is small about 16 per cent; the remainder are being absorbed by the Spanish-speaking population, and it is not to be expected that the use of the Arabic language in these communities will have any protracted existence.

The history of the effect of the proclamation of the Ottoman Constitution on Lebanon is told in the *Guide* (pp. 17-24), and contains much that is scarcely known to specialists even in Ottoman affairs. It appears that the Syrians of Lebanon endeavoured when the new regime commenced to exercise certain rights which under the older regime they had waived; but that they found

difficulties put in their way, and the stream of emigration has in consequence been increased and accelerated since the change of government. The author of the Guide speaks with bitterness of the treatment accorded Lebanon by the European Powers. The rights and wrongs of this matter do not concern this Journal; but the reference to this Guide for a clear statement of the case from the Syrian side may be useful to some readers.

*Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Turque*, par Bedros Effendi Kerestedjian, édité par son neveu Haig. M.R.A.S.: Londres, 1912. Few languages can escape the charge of being mixed, but the title *Mischsprache* seems to suit Turkish in an extraordinary degree. It is acknowledged even by Ottoman savants that the best dictionary of their language is that by Redhouse; little space is devoted in that great work to comparative philology, though its statements even on that subject are ordinarily trustworthy; and nothing in the nature of a historical dictionary, doing for Turkish what e.g. the Venetian savants have done for Armenian, appears to be in existence. Probably much will have to be done in the way of editing Turkish MSS. before such a work becomes possible; the visitor of Bookseller's Row in Constantinople is astonished at the paucity of printed works which have emanated from Ottoman presses, and at the bookshops which have sprung up in numbers in Istanbul since the new regime there is very little variety; a few historical manuals, novels, and volumes of modern poetry constitute the whole stock. Kerestedjian Effendi has made a selection of Turkish words to which he endeavours to find analogues in numerous languages belonging to very different families; clearly his linguistic studies have a very wide range.

D. S. M.

**China. A study in Chinese Archaeology and Religion.**  
By BERNHOLD LAUFER. 68 plates, 6 of which are  
coloured, and 204 text-figures. Chicago, U.S.A.,  
February, 1912.

In 1907 the authorities of the Field Museum of Natural History, of Chicago, commissioned Dr Laufer to carry on research work and make collections in Tibet and China under an endowment provided by Mrs T B Blackstone of that city. Dr Laufer went, saw and collected. On his return it was decided to work up the Chinese material in a series of monographs. This handsome volume of 370 pages is the first of them and even were no other to follow both the Field Museum and the author would well deserve congratulations the former on the selection of so keen and competent an agent and the latter on the success with which he has carried out his quest and the subsequent researches demanded by the specimens acquired.

Singantu alais Hsianin the capital city of Szechuan Province appears to have proved a rich mine of antiquarian treasures for Dr Laufer who was well advised to explore and well furnished to solve this ancient home of wealth.

The plan of the book is after preliminary remarks to divide and classify the specimens of jade submitted to China for the Museum into the various categories and use and application to which Chinese culture from the earliest period has put objects of this fascinating type of materials and while doing so to discuss the various points of custom and belief which they illustrate and help to explain. The book is thus partly a *catalogue raisonné* of the jade exhibits in the Field Museum and partly a series of studies of Chinese antiquity as it discloses itself in these characteristic relics.

The way of the reader is greatly eased and lightened by the very numerous illustrations. Among these

Dr. Laufer has most appropriately included a number of the drawings in the late Wu Ta-ch'ang's *Ku Fu T'u K'ao*, "Investigations into Ancient Jades with Illustrations." Happy that land whose ancient jades can so well stand investigations. As an admirer of that great scholar in another branch of learning, I cannot refrain from quoting the words, both generous and just, in which Dr. Laufer speaks of him (Introduction, p. 13): "Wu Ta-ch'ang is not bound by the fetters of the past and not hampered by the accepted school traditions. With fair and open mind he criticizes the errors of the commentators to the *Chou li*, the *Ku Yu T'u P'u*, and many others, and his common sense leads him to new and remarkable results not anticipated by any of his predecessors. Because my own collection is a counterpart of his being made from an archaeological not an artistic point of view I could choose no better guide for the interpretation of this collection than him. I have followed him with keen admiration and stand to him in the relation of a disciple to his master."



Another excellently true appreciation of the absurd figures of ceremonial and other antiquarian objects evolved (like a certain camel elsewhere) from the inner consciousness of the Sung dynasty scholars will be found on p. 16 of the Introduction. I too have often wondered that such figures could find their way into foreign books (Biot, Panthier, Zottoli, Legge, Couvreur) . . . without a word of comment or criticism."

The whole Introduction is a valuable and interesting essay, but I must pass on to give some sketch of the scope of the chapters that follow, twelve in number. The first is devoted to Jade (whether Jadeite or Nephrite) and other stone implements, and figures numerous chisels, hammers, knives, axes, and hatchets of jade, attributed to the Chou dynasty, and mostly discovered in Shenai province. Among them is one, illustrated on p. 43, of



which, but for the perforation, the miniature in my collection, figured on Plate V, B, of my paper on Chinese Writing in the Chou Dynasty, in the Journal for October, 1911, might almost be a model. Dr. Laufer treats all this part of the subject in a most interesting way. Then come other chapters treating of Jade symbols of Sovereign Power; of Astronomical Instruments; of the stone, used as writing material; of its use in religious worship for images of the cosmic deities, Earth Heaven North, East, South, and West, and of the Dragon a long and valuable contribution to a difficult and obscure subject. Chapters vi to xii deal respectively with Jade Coins and Seals, Personal Ornaments; Amulets of the Dead, Objects used in dressing the corpse, Carvings of animal and human figures in the grave, Jade Vases, and lastly, of Jade in the eighteenth century. These headings will give an idea of the scope of the work. For the manner of it Dr. Laufer brings a trained intelligence and great keenness to his task but above all a certain refreshing and vivid sense of reality, so that in his hands the things of the past lose that ancient and fish-like savour that is apt to hang about them and are made to appear to us as guests of a rational curiosity not as dim ghosts of a distant and distasteful antiquity.

In the course of these pages there naturally occur a number of passages translated from native authors. Dr. Laufer's renderings of these are not in all cases satisfactory. The Chinese written language is a hard taskmaster, and demands before all a long experience which probably the author's other studies and occupations have prevented him from devoting to it. I shall only therefore mention one instance and that simply because Dr. Laufer has been led to infer a phallic symbolism through misunderstanding of the text. On p. 44 he illustrates from the *Chien Shih So* of the brothers Feng, two ancient bronze hatchets and writes: "The latter

(Fig. 6) is interesting with reference to the jade *ding*-*ding* in exhibiting a more primitive form of the triangular pattern, and it is very interesting to take note of the interpretation of the brothers Fêng that this ornament is a *yang wen*, 'a pattern of the male principle.' To this he appends the note: "They expressly deny that it has the function of a written character. The Chinese wording certainly means in our language a phallic emblem." This statement is gravely erroneous. The passage from the *Chin Shih* So is reproduced with the figure, and it really runs thus. Probably used in ancient times as a ceremonial weapon. The face has the figure  in relief [*yang wen*], which is probably the character *yach*, 'battle-axe' [Note by the brother Fêng Yun.] P'êng. With regard to the figure  it is an ornament and not necessarily a character.

But this is a mere speck in an admirable contribution to knowledge which I greatly hope will, in due course be followed by the others projected by the author.

L. C. HOPKINS

A CHINESE-ENGLISH DICTIONARY IN THE CANTONESE DIALECT. By Dr E. J. EITEL. Revised and enlarged by I. G. GINSBURG. Hong Kong: Kelly & Walsh, 1912.

The Cantonese English Dictionary the first half of which was reviewed in a recent number of the JRAS, is now completed.

It contains 8349 Chinese characters, as against 8,002 in Williams's Tonic Dictionary and 10,644 in Eitel's. The first edition of Professor Giles's Mandarin Dictionary has 13,848 characters. In Dr Wells Williams's Tonic Dictionary there are 707 different syllables given; in Eitel's 731, and the number has not been increased in this latest issue. There are as many as 780 syllables

in the Cantonese, that language being one of the richest in that respect in China, as far as is known at present. Some of these syllables represent words which Mr. Genähr has doubtless considered too trivial to be included in the dictionary, yet it is to be hoped that a future edition will not entirely ignore these additional half-hundred syllables.

The highest praise is due to Mr. Genähr for the admirable manner in which the work has been carried out, and the publishers are also to be congratulated on the most creditable way in which the book has been passed through the press.

The student of Cantonese will find it a perfect pleasure to turn over the pages of this Cantonese-English Dictionary as pains have been taken to smother much of the wearisomeness of word hunting and to give a clear and distinct

This dictionary may be put on the shelf as a perfect Chinese-English dictionary without any further recommendation by comparison with it.

J. DYER BALL

CONFUCIUS AND HIS PORTRAITS. By Dr. LEOPOLD LAUFER. With illustrations. Reproduced in the *Open Court* March and April 1912.

This is a most interesting and unique compilation on a subject which has not hitherto been taken up in a systematic manner. The portraits and pictures in which Confucius appears are used thus to serve to point out some of the characteristic features of the career of the sage. The Buddhist and Taoist influences affecting these portraits are well brought out by Dr. Laufer. He also states that it is forbidden to set up an image or likeness of Confucius in a Buddhist or Taoist temple but he does not call attention to the fact that there are temples in which appear the images of

"the Three Founders", Confucius, Lao-tai, and Buddha, seated together as a trinity.

We would add another exception to the two which the writer of this pamphlet gives of statues of Confucius in Confucian temples, viz, one we saw some years ago in a district city not far from Swatow. Here the sage was represented as of a very swarthy countenance.

J. DYER BALL.

**CHINESE POEMS.** Translated by CHARLES BUDD. Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press: London, New York, Toronto, and Melbourne, 1912.

In this book of 174 pages we have some fifty five poems by over thirty Chinese poets. To Fu and Lao Tsien head the list with five each. There are biographical notices of eleven of the poets from whose works selections are made.

Mr. Budd tells us that some of the translations are "nearly literal". Some Chinese poems can be turned into English with almost absolute fidelity to the original, but with others the attempt is impossible and a bald prose rendering is the result. In almost all, however, there is more or less of expansion necessary from the terse Chinese original due to the exigencies of English rhythm and rhyme, and a literal verbal accuracy will not always enable the Western reader to understand the thought of the Far Eastern poet.

The Introduction gives a very short and concise outline of the history of the poetic art in China from its early dawn in ancient Chinese life till it reached its zenith in the great Tang School of Poetry, and even maintained a high position in the Sung and other dynastic periods, when it played a no mean part in Chinese literature.

It is Mr. Budd's intention to publish in a separate volume the originals of these translations, when the

student of Chinese will be able to enjoy these charming morsels as they fell from the pencils of their composers.

A few pages in the present volume are devoted to an account of the technique of Chinese poetry. In them the mysteries of the tonic system as applied to poetic compositions, or in short Chinese rhythm, and some of the different forms which Chinese poems take, are explained.

But why does Mr. Budd write Song and Tong and 'Ho and Bay and a few other peculiarities in the transliterations of Chinese names? Hyphens are also scattered about too profusely in the names of these poets. The rule that prevails and is generally followed in the transliteration of the names of persons from Chinese into English is that surnames are not joined by a hyphen to the other syllables forming the name unless the surname is a double one. This rule is not adhered to in this book, being sometimes observed and sometimes not.

J. DYER BALL.

CHINESE LEGENDS AND LYRICS By W. A. P. MARTIN  
D.D., LL.D., President Emeritus of the Imperial  
Tung Wên College, Peking etc. author of *A Guide to  
Cathay* and other books. Second edition. Shanghai  
Messrs. Kelly & Walsh, 1912

This veteran sinologue is well known for his admirable rendering of Chinese poems. The selection he originally made for translation was small but choice, but as the years have passed he has added to that number till we have now in the volume before us of 123 pages some fifty odd pieces of which nearly thirty are reproductions in English poetic form of Chinese masterpieces while others are translations from German etc. and a few are from the lyric muse of Dr. Martin himself. Among the number appears the curious and remarkable poem entitled "A Chinese Raven", which, written nearly 2,000 years

ago, bears striking points of resemblance to Edgar Allan Poe's celebrated poem of the "Raven".

The book is illustrated with half a dozen reproductions of photographs.

J. DYER BALL.

**A HISTORY OF JAPAN. By HUNO SATO. Translated by ELIZABETH LEE. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd., 1912.**

A succinct and well-written history of the Island Kingdom. The book is divided into periods, these into parts, and these last into chapters. Beginning with the earliest inhabitants of the land and then passing on to the origin of the Japanese, we are carried through all the ages to modern times, for the narrative ends on p. 250 with the date of August 29, 1912. Sufficient is told to interest the reader without surfeiting him with lengthy detail. Thus we get accounts of Japan's dealings with Korea in the far distant past as well as in modern times. The intercourse with China, the introduction of Chinese civilisation and culture, and the resultant improved condition of the people, with the progress in their economic life, are acknowledged. The Greek style in the architecture of the Horiuji shrine in combination with Indian and Chinese influences is noted. The Buddhistic movements are touched on and the tragic episodes connected with the suppression of Christianity. Bushido, the relations with foreign nations, the Chino- and the Russo-Japanese wars all come under notice, but it is impossible to mention all the interesting points which are brought under review in this admirable little history. 1661 is given as the date of the foundation of the Manchu dynasty in China instead of 1644.

J. DYER BALL.

**THE TOMA DIARY.** Translated from the Japanese by  
W. M. FOWLER. London: Henry Frowde, 1912.

The *Toma Diary* is a record of a long journey home to Kyoto of a retiring Japanese Governor from one of the provinces nearly a thousand years ago. It occupies a high place in Japanese literature. Unlike many of the literary productions of the East, its style is simple and yet the language is elegant. The narrative is a plain statement of the incidents which occurred to this old-world traveller along a part of the extensive sea-girt coast of Japan, and everything is told in an artless manner with a touch of humour. There is a sad note in a minor key, a pathetic wail from a desolate parent's heart for the little daughter who went with him to his distant governorship, but he now returns without her "bereft and sad."

Not only was the author famous as a prose writer but he was also renowned as a poet, and the suspicion occurs to one whether the prose in this little book was not written as a vehicle for the production of the poetry, for the verse is as frequent as plums in a Christmas pudding. At every opportunity, or, if none presents itself, one is made for the presentation of a little five-lined *tanka* poem with its thirty-one syllables. The translation has retained the original metre of this form of Japanese verse. The Japanese in romanized form is printed on one page and on the opposite page is the English translation. The binding of the book is attractive and the whole format is tasty.

J. DYER BALL

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA. THE MUSEUM. Publications of the Babylonian Section Vol. I, No. 1. *Babylonian Hymns and Prayers*. By DAVID W. MYHRMAN, Eckley Brinton Cove, Junior. Fand Philadelphia: published by the University Museum, 1911.

This portion of the extensive publication of the Babylonian tablets in the collections at Philadelphia.

U.S.A., has thirty-four autographed and thirteen photolithographed plates of inscriptions, being copies of eighteen texts in all. From the introduction we learn that the documents were found at various periods between 1888 and 1900. They are stated to be apparently made of a special kind of carefully prepared clay, and, being thoroughly well baked, they all present the same colouring—a pale brown, as though all forming part of the same batch. Though fairly clear and distinct, the writing of the earlier ones is small and somewhat crowded, and the constant use of a "tube" (magnifying-glass), and a good light were needed to produce trustworthy copies. All the tablets have suffered considerably, and consist of two or more pieces joined together.

The Sumerian portion of this collection contains hymns to Innanna (Istar) Gisdar, Nina, Enki (Ea), Nin mah, Mullil (the dialectic form of the name of Enlil, Ellil, or Illil) Ninip etc., and the Semitic Babylonian addresses to Samas Ea Enlil, Merodach, the Anunnaki, etc. These latter were inscribed, to all appearance, by the orders of Samas-sum-ukin (Samsuchinos), the brother of Assurbanipal king of Assyria, and, unlike those of an earlier date are clearly and legibly written.

Dr. Myhrman is right in describing the earlier tablets as difficult. This is caused partly by their incompleteness, but is in some cases due to the closeness of the characters in certain places. With documents of this nature the copyist is naturally the proper person to make the translation and it is to be hoped that Dr. Myhrman will undertake the task. With regard to the photographs, though to all appearance sharply focussed, the lighting is probably not the best for the decipherment of Babylonian inscriptions, and the plate-paper, though smooth, has not the surface needed to show all the detail. It may also be remarked, by the way, that the tablet proto-lithographed on pl. xlii is printed upside down.





dockets, most of which have been already published, though some of them are new. About two-thirds as many texts as are contained in this volume remain to be published, and are of the reign of Artaxerxes I. In addition to the plates there is an introductory preface of two pages, thirty-four pages of names of men, women, cities, gates, and canals, an index of words and names in the Aramaic dockets, a tabulated list of the texts, a list of the Aramaic dockets, and a table of equivalent numbers, from which we learn that sixty-three of the tablets are in the Imperial Museum, Constantinople, and the remainder in the College Museum, Philadelphia.

These documents are of the same nature as those already published in the ninth and tenth volumes of *The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania Series A—Cuneiform Texts*, edited by H. V. Hilprecht, the copies and introductions being by the author of the present work. The inscriptions deal with such things as bailing a man out of prison, engaging to repay loans in kind or money lent, the receipt of rent of fields, the hire of slaves, oxen, or other cattle, the leasing of fishponds and houses etc. In the present volume the great proportion of these inscriptions refer to dates, but some deal with grain of various kinds, slaves, oxen, fields, silver, wine and meal, and other matters. Many of the inscriptions are unfortunately imperfect, but restorations will in many cases be possible by comparing them with more complete documents of the same class. The following, being short, may be quoted as a specimen:

"1 *gur* of wheat (?) (*kibla*), belonging to Ninip-uballit, servant of Ribat, unto Iddia, son of Nana-iddina. In the month Iyyar, year 4th, the wheat (?) (*kibla*), 1 *gur*, by the measure (𐎶𐎵𐎶 = *masihu*?) of Ninip-uballit, in the city Naqadin, he shall repay.

"Witnesses: Ellil-dānu, son of Kalkal-iddina; Ablaya, son of Linuh-libbi-ili; Ninip-uballit, son of Bullut-a;

Ellil-ittannu, son of Ellil-kasir. Scribe: Nidintu-Ellil, son of Iqtiaya. Nippur, month Chisleu, day 2nd, year 3rd, Darius, king of the lands."

Aramaic docket, as transcribed by Professor Clay: "𐤀𐤏𐤁𐤁 𐤁𐤏 (𐤁) (𐤁) 𐤁𐤏 𐤁𐤏𐤁, "Document (concerning) wheat (𐤁), 1 gur, against Iddiya."

The word which I render as "wheat" is expressed by the Sumerian *še-gig-ba* (*še-gib-ba*), possibly so called as "the heavy" grain. The second word of the Aramaic docket is very doubtful on account of the careless writing of the beginning and the mutilation of the end. Professor Clay reads the first three uprights as two characters, 𐤁𐤏, and the remaining strokes of the word, three in number, may be the badly written traces of 𐤁𐤏, making the word 𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤁, Heb. 𐤁𐤏𐤁, "wheat." Both reading and meaning however, are doubtful.

Besides the inherent interest of these inscriptions the names they contain are of considerable importance. Many of them are Hebrew and testify to the influence of that race in the land of their captivity. There are several names ending in *Yima* (*-Yim*), now generally recognized as the Babylonian spelling of Jehovah and as Professor Clay has pointed out, the plural of the ideograph for "god", 𐤁𐤏, is used for the Hebrew *El*. At that early date it was probably pronounced with a vocalic termination, making *El* or something similar as contended by Hilprecht. The "Legend of Chedor-laomer", as pointed out by Sayce uses the plural ideograph to express the singular when speaking of Merodach. The list contains many identifications of the numerous Persian names found on these tablets. Egyptians traded in the district, and there was a town inhabited by Hittites. The publication of such texts as these forms a body of commercial and legal inscriptions with which any editor might well be content.

T. G. PINCHES.

**DOCUMENTS FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPUR  
DATED IN THE REIGNS OF THE KASSITE RULERS.**

By ALBERT T. CLAY. 8 by 10½ inches. Philadelphia:  
published by the University Museum, 1912.

This is the second part of the same volume of the publications of the Babylonian section of the University of Pennsylvania Museum, and consists of 32 pages of letterpress and 72 plates of inscriptions (144 texts). These documents are all of the Kassite period, and form a further instalment of the excellent series published under the editorship of Professor Hilprecht, vols. xiv and xv of *The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania* with the same sub-title as the present contribution. Many refer to the payment of taxes, and are in a tabulated form. Some, however, record deliveries and receipts of various productions, including manufactured drinks, bronze for the metal-workers, gold for the goldsmiths, skins for covering things, leather for carriages, chairs, etc. Those which are dated were written in the reigns of Burna-Buriash II, Kurigalzu II, Nazi-Maruttas, Kadasman-Turgu, Kadasman-Enlil II, Kudur-Enlil, Šagarakti-Šuriak, and Kaštiliašu (p. 64), between 1450 and 1309 B.C. Among the more interesting tablets is that giving a list of the amounts received at the gates of the city (Nippur) — "the festival-gate, the water(-)gate, the gate of Addu (Hadad), the gate of the elders of Uruwa (U'r), the upper and lower gates of the city Hiluni, and the gate of the King's sons." No. 105, which is to all appearance an inventory of stones and articles of jewellery, has a number of interesting words. Of a different nature is the inscription referring to "6 fetters with their rings, 1 talent 36 *manu* their weight", mentioned in connexion with 6 men *4i surda ipulu*, "who have done wrong." Unfortunately this inscription is in an imperfect state, so that its real drift is doubtful. Of more than ordinary interest, also, is No. 20, dated in the fourth year of

**Nasi-Maruttai.** This document bears on all six surfaces the impressions of a seal showing men and humped oxen at the plough. The owner's name was Arad-Ninur, and it is to be hoped that other impressions of a like nature may be found—Professor Clay points out that the plough was provided with a tube for sowing the grain, similar to some that are found in Syria to-day. There is an interesting alphabetical list of names, many of which are Kassite, and will form useful material for the study of that language. The few (seeming) misprints *A-mi-lu-nju* (*-nyn*), *Amul-Hulaku* (*-Hulaku*), *MAY-GAR I-AD* (*NAM*.) are easily corrected by reference to the author's copies. Translations of selected texts are not given but are promised in a separate volume which all students will look forward to.

A scholarly production, full of interest in which the reputation of the University of Pennsylvania and the author is well sustained.

T. G. PINCHES

# NOTES OF THE QUARTER

(October-December, 1912).

## I. GENERAL MEETINGS OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

*November 12, 1912.*—The Right Hon. Sir Mortimer Durand, Director, took the chair, and afterwards Sir Charles Lyall, Vice-President.

The Chairman referred to the death of the late Director, Sir Raymond West, and spoke of his great learning and attainments. A full obituary notice appears in the current number of the Journal.

The following were elected members of the Society :

Mr. Ram Rakha Mal Bhandari.  
Professor Rama Deva.  
Dr. Alfred Westharp.  
Yacoub Artin Pasha.

Twenty-seven nominations were announced for election at the next general meeting.

Mr. Legge read a paper on "Western Manichæism and the recent Discoveries at Turfan".

A discussion followed, in which Mr. Kennedy, Professor Bevan, Professor Browne, Professor Margoliouth, and Dr. Denison Ross took part.

*December 10, 1912.*—Lord Reay, President, in the Chair.

The following were elected members of the Society :—

Mr. Kandadai Vaidinath Subramanya Aiyer.	Mr. Godfrey F. S. Collins, B.A., I.C.S.
Mr. I. T. O. Barnard.	Mr. Suresh Chandra Gupta, M.A.
Mr. A. Walton Rattersby.	Moulvi Wahed Hossein.
Baba Surendra Nath Chowdhury.	Rev. B. M. Jones.

Mr. Radhakumud Mookerji.	Sardar Darshan Singh.
Munshi Mohaminal Munn-ul-din.	Babu Lal Sud.
Mr. Rajani Nath Nandi.	Mr. Mohan Lal Tannan.
Captain B. E. A. Pritchard, I.A.	Professor Hira Lal Basu.
Rev. W. C. B. Purser, M.A.	Professor Lutfi Levonian.
Kumar Sarat Kumar Rai, M.A.	Rev. C. T. Lipschitz.
Babu Girija Prasanna Sanyal, M.A.	Mr. G. R. T. Ross, M.A., I.E.S.
Rev. W. Sherratt.	Rev. C. T. H. Walker, M.A.
Sardar Arjan Singh.	Major Horace Hayman Wilson.
	Mr. John Hilditch.

Two nominations were approved for election at the next general meeting.

Mr. A. M. Blackman read a paper entitled "The Decorated Tomb-Chapels at Meir, Upper Egypt".

A discussion followed, in which Dr. Pinches, Mr. Legge, and Professor Hagopian took part.

## SPECIAL GENERAL MEETING.

*December 10, 1912*

The McGill University Oriental Society was admitted as an Associate Society at a Special General Meeting summoned for that purpose.

## II. PRINCIPAL CONTENTS OF ORIENTAL JOURNALS

### I. ZEITSCHRIFT DER DEUTSCHEN MORGENLANDISCHEN GESELLSCHAFT. Bd. LXVI. Heft i.

Baudissin (W. W. G.) Tammuz bei den Hattäern  
 Speer (H. H.). Four Poems by Nimr Ibn Adwan.  
 Franke (R. O.) Die Suttanipata-Gathas mit ihren  
 Parallelen

Heft iii.

Weinheimer (H.). Die Einwanderung der Hebräer und der Israeliten in Kanaan.  
 Torczyner (H.). Anmerkungen zum Hebräischen und zur Bibel.

Wünsche (Aug.) Die Zahlensprüche in Talmud und Midrasch

Mills (L. H.) Yasna XLIV, 11-20, a study *et* a new edition.

Nielsen (D.). Der semitische Venuskult

Sukthankar (V.). Miscellaneous Notes on Maṇuṣa's Kāvya-prakāśa.

## II. JOURNAL ASIATIQUE. Tome XIX, No. II.

Amar (E.). Prolegomènes à l'étude des historiens arabes par Khalil ibn Aibak Aṣ Ṣafadi, publiés et traduits d'après les manuscrits de Paris et de Vienne

Ronkel (Ph. S. van). Une amulette arabo-malaise.

Poussin (L. de la Vallée). Essai d'identification des Gāthās et des Udānas en prose de l'Udānavarga de Dharmatrāta.

Bloch (J.). Le dialecte des fragments Dutreuil de Rhins

Grierson (G. A.). Etymologies tokhariennes.

Biarnay (J.). Six textes en dialecte berlère des Berabier de Dades.

## III. RIVISTA DEGLI STUDI ORIENTALI. Vol. IV, Fasc. III

Meloni (G. L.). Testi assiri del British Museum

Rossini (C. Conti). Studi su popolazioni dell'Etiopia.

Lammens (H.). Zīād ibn Abūḥ vice-roy de l'Iraq lieutenant de Moawia I.

Bescher (O.). Arabische Handschriften des Top Kapu Seraj

Belloni-Filippi (F.). Di una redazione inedita del Commento Mallinathiano all'ottavo sarga del Kumārambhava.

## IV. BULLETTIN DE L'ÉCOLE FRANÇAISE D'EXTRÊME ORIENT. Tome XI, Nos. III-IV.

Huber (E.). Études Indochinoises, VIII-XII.

Daloustal (R.). La Justice dans l'ancien Annam, traduction et commentaire du Code des Lā.

Peri (N.). A propos de la date de Vasuhandhu.



Cordes (G.). *Études Cambodgiennes.*

Cadère (L.). *Notes sur quelques emplacements Chams de la province de Quang-tri.*

Quynh (Pham). *Nhân nguyệt vân đáp.* Dialogue entre l'homme et la lune, poème annamite traduit.

**Tome XII, No. i.**

Maspero (H.). *Études sur la phonétique historique de la langue annamite. Les initiales.*

**V. JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY.**

**Vol. XXXII, Pt. III.**

Blake (F. R.). *Comparative Syntax of the Combinations formed by the Noun and its Modifiers in Semitic.*

Lichte (O.). *Das Sendschreiben des Patriarchen Barschun schan an den Catholicus der Armenier*

**VI DER ISLAM. Bd III, Heft III.**

Goldziher (I.). *Aus der Theologie des Fachr al din al-Razi*

Massignon (L.). *Ana al-Haqq. Etude historique et critique sur une formule dogmatique de theologie mystique d'après les sources islamiques*

Becker (C. H.). *Vorbericht über die islamkundlichen Ergebnisse der Innereafrikaexpedition des Herzogs Adolf Friedrich von Mecklenburg*

Seidel (E.). *Medezinisches aus den Heidelberger Papyri Schott Reinhardt IV*

**Heft IV**

Amedroz (H. F.). *The Vizier Abu'l Fadh'l Isma'il Amir*

Stephan (F. v.). *Legende über den Ursprung der Fabel und der Botanik nach der Erzählung des Majma Ah Babul*

Jacob (G.). *Quellenbeiträge zur Geschichte islamischer Bauwerke*

Bell (H. I.). *Translations of the Greek Apocryphic Papyri in the British Museum*

Becker (C. H.). *Zur Geschichte des islamischen Kultus.*

VII. **GIORNALE DELLA SOCIETÀ ASIATICA ITALIANA.**  
**Vol. XXIV, 1911.**

- Zanotti (A.).** Studio sul raddoppiamento allitterazione e ripetizione nell'armeno antico.  
**Tenitori (L. P.).** Il Rāmacaritamānasa o il Rāmāyaṇa.  
**Belloni-Filippi (F.).** Dharmavijaya-sūtra.  
**Meloni (G.).** Alcune riflessioni intorno alle similitudini dei Semiti  
**Strauss (O.).** Ethische Probleme aus dem Mahābhārata.  
**Ballini (A.).** La Upaniṣadbhavaprapaṇca kathā di Siddharsi.  
**Pavolini (P. E.).** Recenti lavori sulla Bhagavadgītā

VIII. **JOURNAL OF THE PANJAB HISTORICAL SOCIETY**  
**Vol. I, No. 1**

- Thompson (J. P.).** The Tomb of the Emperor Jahangir  
**Abdul Qadir (Sheikh).** Abulfazl  
**Vogel (J. Ph.).** Historical Notes on the Lahore Fort  
**Griswold (H. D.).** Vedic Social Life  
**Irving (M.).** The Shrine of Baba Farid Shukargarj at Pakpattan  
**Whitehead (R.).** A new Pathan Sultan of Delhi  
**MacLagan (E. D.).** The Travels of Fray Sebastian Manrique in the Panjab 1641

IX. **TRANSACTIONS OF THE ASIATIC SOCIETY OF JAPAN.**  
**Vol. XXXVIII, Pt. V.**

- Reischauer (A. K.).** A Catechism of the Shin Sect (Buddhism)

X. **ASIAN QUARTERLY REVIEW.** Vol. XXXIV, No. LXVII.

- Waddell (L. A.).** Tibetan MSS. and Books, etc., collected during the Younghusband Mission to Lhasa.  
**Stewart (F.).** Letters from the Nizam's Camp, 1791-4.  
 Edited with an Introduction.

## XI. THE QWEST. Vol. III, No. iv.

- Mead (G. R. S.) Some Features of Buddhist Psychology.  
 Eider (R.) John the Baptist in the light of a New  
 Samaritan Document  
 Hardestad (Miss A. L. B.) A Mandaean Mystery Ritual.  
 Chatley (H.) The Kabbalism of China

XII. TRANSACTIONS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE JAPAN  
SOCIETY. Vol. IX, Pt. iii

- Spier (R. Phene) Japanese Reefs.  
 Cheshire (H. F.) The Japanese Game of Go  
 Strange (E. F.) The Art of Kyozai  
 Koop (A. J.) The Construction and Blazonry of Mon

## XIII. TOYŌ GAKKŌ Vol. I, No. 1 (on Japanese).

- Tsumaki (T.) Study on Taoism  
 Imanishi (R.) Ruins and Relics at Kyōgyū the ancient  
 capital of Silla

## Vol. I, No. ii

- Haneda (K.) An Ancient Tomb at Tiao chia tun in  
 Lashun  
 Haneda (T.) An explanation of the Historical Materials  
 relating to Sin king Province in China

## Vol. I, No. iii

- Shiratori (K.) Geographical and Historical Study of the  
 Western Regions of Chinese History  
 Tsumaki (C.) Explanation of five old Buddhist Records  
 discovered in the Tun huang Grotto in Sinkiang  
 Tsuda (S.) Relation of the Chinese Plays of the Yuan  
 Dynasty to the No of Ashikaga Era in Japan

## Vol. II, No. iii

- Hashimoto (M.) A Study of the Ancient Chinese Classic,  
 Shu-ching.

**Tsunaki (T.).** Essay on the Engraving of the Buddhist Scripture, *Tai tsang ching*, in Kitai.

**Hamada (K.).** An Archaeological Investigation in Southern Manchuria.

#### XIV JOURNAL OF THE BURMA RESEARCH SOCIETY.

Vol. I, Pt. I.

**Furnivall (J. S.).** Matriarchal Vestiges in Burma

**Taw Sein Ko.** The Earliest Use of the Buddhist Era in Burma

**Brown (R. Grant).** Human Sacrifices near the Upper Chindwin

— The Kings of Burma

**Antisdal (Rev. C. B.).** Elementary Studies in Lahou, Ahka and Wa Languages.

The Lahou Narrative of Creation

**Houghton (B.).** Anthropometric Data of the Talangs

**Gilmore (Rev. D.).** Karen Folk lore

**Maung Tin.** Missionary Burmese

Vol. I, Pt. II

**Taw Sein Ko.** Chinese Antiquities at Pagan

**Furnivall (J. S.).** The Foundation of Pagan

**Saya Thein.** Shin Sawbu

**Brown (R. Grant).** Linguistic Survey of India

**S. A.** The Derivation of Pronouns

**Stewart (J. A.).** Burmese Nursery Rhymes

**R. A. S.** Burmese Folk lore

#### XV PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL ARCHEOLOGY. Vol. XXXIV, Pt. IV.

**Legge (F.).** The Lion-headed God of the Mithraic Mysteries

**Hall (H. R.).** Note on the Reign of Amenhotep II.

**Pinches (T. G.).** The Bird of Temple Z at Babylon.

**Mahler (Dr. E.).** Notes on the Funeral Statuettes of the Ancient Egyptians.

**Langdon (Dr. S.).** The Originals of Two Religious Texts of the Ashurbanipal Library.

— A Cylinder Seal of the Hammurabi Period.

**XVI. T'oung Pao. Vol. XIII, No. II.**

**Petrucel (R.).** Le Kie Tseu yuan houa tchouan.

**Cordier (H.).** Le premier traité de la France avec le Japon.

**Vanhée (L.).** Algèbre Chinoise.

**Pelliot (P.).** La fille de Mo-tch'o qughan et ses rapports avec Kül-tegin.

**Lévi (S.).** Wang Hiuan ts'ü et Kaniška.

**Vol. XIII, No. III.**

**Petrucchi (R.).** Le Kie Tsen yuan houa tchouan.

**Pelliot (P.).** Autour d'une traduction sanscrite du Tao to king.

**Moule (A. C.).** Marco Polo's Sinjumatu.

**XVII. TIJDSCHRIFT VOOR INDISCHE TAAL-LAND EN  
VORKENKUNDE. Deel LIV, Afd. I-II.**

**Krom (N. J.).** A propos d'une tête de statue trouvée à Tjandi Séwou.

**Rinkes (D. A.).** Les Saints de Java.

**Moquette (J. P.).** La date de l'épigraphie de Malik Ibrahim à Grissé.

**Ronkel (Ph. S. van).** Mahājāna en sanscrit — mahājāna en malais.

**XVIII. NUMISMATICS CHRONICLE, 1912. Pt. III.**

**Rogers (Rev. E.).** Rare and Unpublished Coins of the Seleucid Kings of Syria.

**Allan (J.).** The Coinage of the Maldive Islands, with some Notes on the Cowrie and Larin.

**XIX. ANNALS OF ARCHEOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY**  
(Liverpool) Vol. V, Nos. 1 u.

Gierstang (J.) Second Interim Report on the Excavations  
at Salije-Geuzi in North Syria, 1911.

-- Third Interim Report on the Excavations at Merbe.

— and T. D. Lee. The Linen Girdle of Ramesses III.

**XX. LE MONDE ORIENTAL.** Vol. VI, Fasc. II.

Mattmon (E.). *Tulit il'umr, texte arabe vulgaire transcrit  
et traduit avec introduction, notes et commentaire.*

Charpentier (J.). *Zur altindischen Etymologie.*

Wiklund (K. B.). *Anlautendes θ im finnisch-ugrischen.*

**XXI. THE INDIAN ANTIQUARY.** Vol. XLJ, Pt. DXXIII.

Bhandarkar (D. R.) Some Unpublished Inscriptions.

Kane (P. V.) Outlines of the History of the *Alamkara*  
Literature

Ojha (Gaurishankar H.) Coins of Ajayadeva and  
Somaladeva

Rose (H. A.) Contributions to Panjabi Lexicography.



## OBITUARY NOTICES

### SIR RAYMOND WEST, K.C.I.E., LL.D.

RAYMOND WEST, the second son of Frederick Henry West and his wife Frances nee Raymond, was born in county Kerry on September 18, 1832. His father seems to have frequently shifted his residence from England to Ireland and from one place in Ireland to another, returning for a time to England probably on medical advice. He was a man of ready wit and artistic tastes who devoted his short life to literary pursuits, in which he attained some distinction. The mother, a daughter of Richard Raymond, of Ballylonghane, Kerry, belonging to the Essex family of that name, was endowed with a mind and personality of a high order, and to her the son owed the intellectual atmosphere and encouragement which a good education and the companionship of clever associates bring within the reach of most boys intended for the public service. For Raymond West's whole educational equipment consisted of attendance at the nearest school, whether in Kennington, Dublin, or other parts of Ireland, followed by matriculation at Queen's College, Galway, where he won first-class honours both in Classics and Physics. He was seriously contemplating the adoption of the medical profession when public notice was given that twenty writerships in the service of the East India Company would be awarded by competitive examination to be held in July, 1855. For these well-advertised and much coveted prizes 126 candidates were examined by an eminent Board of Examiners, which included Sir James Stephens, the late Archbishop Temple, Max Müller, G. G. Stokes, Professor Living, Rawlinson, and other well-known men. West passed 19th on the list with



1,134 marks, one-half of the marks obtained by the first successful candidate, finding amongst his colleagues Charles Aitchison, John Cordery, James Peile, and G. Pedder, of whom the last two went with him to Bombay. His almost illegible handwriting and the disadvantages of his education no doubt contributed to this result.

A year's preparatory study in London preceded his arrival in Bombay on September 18, 1856, and almost at once West advanced to the position which his industry and natural abilities deserved. Within four months he had passed in Marathi, and was sent to Belgium to study Canarese, in which language he attained such unusual proficiency as induced Government to entrust to him in 1861 the task of translating into Canarese the Penal and the Criminal Procedure Codes.

Whatever of Irish spirit was in him was soon called into play. Whilst James Peile was watching scenes of mutiny and sending to the *Times* graphic descriptions of the punishment of mutineers at Ahmedabad West as assistant to G. B. Seton Karr was not less actively engaged in the south of the Presidency in the stirring scenes which followed the disloyal attitude taken up by the brother of the Raja of Kolhapur with the rebels in 1857, the murder of the political agent Manson by Bhaskar Rao, brother of the Chief of Bandung at Nargund, and the Savant disturbances. For his services he received the Mutiny medal and until 1860 he continued to hold executive appointments in the Revenue Department, which gave him an insight into the lives and habits of Indian society soon to be turned to good account in his subsequent judicial services.

In 1860 he commenced his judicial career as assistant Judge in Dharwar, attracting notice by the thorough manner in which he supervised and controlled the subordinate civil courts. He was transferred to Kaira in 1862, thence joining the Secretariat of Government, and

was next made Registrar of Her Majesty's High Court, Bombay, in the following year, where he employed his leisure hours in the important work of editing the first three volumes of the Bombay laws and regulations, with valuable notes and annotations. After an interval of much needed rest he resumed charge of the office of Registrar in 1864, having declined the tempting offer of the Judgeship of Ahmedabad because he wished to complete his training for such an office. His self-denial only strengthened his claim on preferment, and in 1866 he acted as Judge of Kanara, being further promoted in 1868 to the responsible office of Judicial Commissioner in Sind. That outlying but integral part of the Presidency of Bombay was outside the jurisdiction of the High Court and its judicial administration needed the hand of reform and reorganization. West had already acquired a high reputation for thoroughness and legal knowledge, and the publication in 1867 of his masterly digest of the Hindu law of inheritance, partition and adoption, in which he was assisted by the great Sanskrit scholar Dr Buhler had attracted attention far beyond the limits of India. His deputation to Sind was not only deserved, but it was fruitful of good results, although a long course of overwork compelled him to take furlough for two years in May 1869. He proceeded to England with his wife, Clementina Fergusson only daughter of William M Chute, of Chute Hall, county Kerry, to whom he had been married at Tanna on February 16, 1867. It may be mentioned here that she died on April 28, 1896, leaving one son and three daughters surviving her. One of her daughters married Mr. Claude Hill, a distinguished member of the Indian Civil Service, now Member of the Council of Bombay, and another is the wife of Mr. L. S. R. Byrne, a master at Eton College.

Furlough without occupation would not have been any relaxation to West, and although a call to the Irish Bar

could add nothing to his qualifications for judicial work, he returned to duty in 1871 with the added titles of Barrister-at-law and M.A. and with the fruits of extensive study in all branches of law. The next period of his service from 1871 to 1886 constituted a record of eminently distinction as a High Court Judge such as few judges, whether barristers or civilians, have achieved. A few breaks in his continuity of service were caused by acting appointments until he was confirmed as Judge in 1873, and by his deputation to Simla in 1879 on the Indian Law Commission, to whose report he contributed the chapter on principles of codification, and then in 1884 to Cairo as Procureur Général of Egypt. Of his work in Egypt it is sufficient to say that his thorough scheme of reform hardly realized the temporary difficulties of the situation, but his labours materially assisted those who followed him. His activities moreover were not confined to his duties on the Bench. In 1878 he became Vice-Chancellor of the University of Bombay, he was President of the Bombay branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, and to his own service he gave valuable aid in administering and then arranging the transfer of the Civil Service Provident Fund to Government. But his title to lasting remembrance as a public servant rests upon the learned judgments which he delivered in the High Court. The Bombay High Court Reports and Indian Law Reports are accessible to all who may wish to realize the wide range of information and the trained judgment which distinguished Raymond West as a Judge, and no important case of Hindu law is to day argued or settled in the Privy Council without constant reference to his monumental treatise and his decisions from the Bench.

With his appointment as Member of Council an office held by him from November 12 1887 until his resignation in April, 1892, a period covering parts of the Governorships of Lord Reay and Lord Harris, West entered upon

new duties for which his early life of comparative isolation and his strictly judicial experience had not so fully equipped him. So far as the judicial work of Government and especially its appellate jurisdiction in native states were concerned unusual success and public satisfaction resulted from his administration. But having never experienced the insensible education which a public school freely distributes out of the class-room, he was not predisposed to compromise, and he applied to executive questions and revenue administration a strict and conservative view of justice that led him into conflict with his colleague in Council and the administrative heads of departments who desired to free the ryots and helpless masses of the population from the technicalities of the law. Believing that civil judges were the best human interpreters of right and wrong West strenuously opposed measures like the Decan Agriculturist Relief Act, which invaded the 'sanctity of contracts' or projects which involved a curtailment of the peasants' right of sale and mortgage of land, which he regarded as unwarrantable restrictions of the rights of property. His nature was perhaps too sensitive, and a want of pliability with something of pedantry prevented recognition by others of his really kindly nature. Yet he rendered invaluable services to Government and his minutes were a mine of deep and far-flung study. If a question of cantonment jurisdiction in a native state came up, Grotius, Vattel, and Puffendorf were accurately and aptly quoted or a Bhayad dispute from Morvi would suggest an essay on feudal tenures or property in land worthy of Neesham or Maine. If the power of reading his notes is not a lost art they must always guide future wayfarers on the dusty paths of the Bombay secretariat. He knew by heart the pithy sayings of famous judges, and was never at a loss to write on any subject. But if his industry through life was thus rewarded by a ready

pen, he paid the penalty of overwork in sleeplessness and the writer can well remember his somewhat distressing experience of the learned judge's paces up and down the verandah by the seaside at Bombay in the very early hours of the morning.

After his retirement, West found interest in teaching Indian law at Cambridge to selected candidates for the Civil Service, in discharging modest duties at the Penge police-court as a Justice of the Peace and in continuous reading. Amongst the honours which he received the honorary degree of LL.D. given by the University of Bombay on March 24, 1892, was much appreciated. He was honoured by the University of Edinburgh on the occasion of its tercentenary celebrations with the degree of LL.D., and received the same honour from the Queen's University of Ireland. The French distinction of *Officier de l'Instruction Publique* was conferred on him in 1910. In June, 1888 he had received from his own Sovereign the dignity of a Knight Commander of the most eminent order of the Indian Empire. In the transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society he took a prominent part being President of the Bombay Society and after his retirement he became Vice-President and subsequently Director of the London Society.

Modest as well as learned philosopher in temperament and yet of a broad sympathy which endeared him to many Hindu friends he lived to the age of 80 despite the strain of overwork and sleeplessness which he bore with undaunted courage. He died at Upper Norwood on September 8, 1912 and was buried at St. Mary Churchyard on the 12th of that month leaving his widow Anne Kirkpatrick daughter of Surgeon-General H. Cook whom he had married on June 12, 1901 and the four children by his previous marriage mentioned above surviving him.

WILLIAM LEE WATSON.

## ADDITIONS TO THE LIBRARY

**Allen, J.** *The Coinage of the Maldives Islands.* 8vo. *London, 1912.*  
*From the Author.*

**Asakawa, K.** *Some of the Contributions of Fendal Japan to the New Japan.* Pamphlet. 8vo. *s.l., 1912.*  
*From the Author.*

**BARNKBRÄUN.** *Buch der Strahlen.* Übersetzung usw. von A. Moberg. 1<sup>er</sup> Teil. 8vo. *Leipzig, 1912.*  
*From the Publisher.*

**Blackman, A. M.** *The Temple of Dendûr.* 4to. *Le Caire, 1911.*  
*From the Author.*

**Budd, C.** *Chinese Poems.* 8vo. *Oxford, 1912.*  
*From the Publishers.*

**BURNEY PAPERS.** Vol. II, pt. vi; vol. III, pt. i. 4to. *Bangkok, 1912.*  
*From the Vajiravādāna National Library.*

**Caland, W.** *Die Jaiminiya-Saṃhita.* (Indische Forschungen, Heft n.) 8vo. *Breslau, 1907.*  
*Purchased.*

**Campbell, Rev. W.** *Notes of Work in South Formosa during 1911.* 8vo. *Tokyo, 1912.*  
*From the Author.*

**Coemaraswamy, Dr. A. K.** *Art and Swadeshi.* 8vo. *Madras [1912].*  
*From the Author.*

**Cordier, H.** *Bibliotheca Sinica.* 2<sup>me</sup> éd. 4 vols. 8vo. *Paris, 1904-8.*  
*Purchased.*

**Crosthwait, Major H. L.** *Investigation of the Theory of Icastasy in India.* 4to. *Dehra Dun, 1912.*  
*From the Government of India.*

**Chulalongkorn, H.M. the late King.** *The Festivals of the Twelve Months.* 8vo. *Bangkok, 1912.*  
*From the Vajiravādāna National Library.*

**Dahlmann, J.** *Die Thomas-Legende.* 8vo. Freiburg, 1912.  
*From the Publisher.*

**David, Mrs. Rhys.** *Buddhism.* 8vo. London 1912.  
*From the Author.*

**Deussen, P.** *System of the Vedānta.* Translated from the German by C. Johnston. 8vo. Chicago, 1912.  
*From Messrs. Luzac & Co.*

**DHANANJAYA.** *The Daktaripa.* Translated (and edited) by G. C. O. Haas. 8vo. New York, 1912.  
*From the Columbia University Press.*

**EIGHT QUESTIONS** of King Bodraja of Ayudhya, solved by Hondej Phra Buddha (thosacariya A.D. 1690, with Preface by H.R.H. Prince Dairong. 8vo. Bangkok, 1912.  
*From the Vajiravādhan National Library.*

**Ephraim, S.** *Prose Refutations of Mani, Marcion, and Bardaisan* Transcribed by C. W. Mitchell. Vol. 1. (Text and Translation Society.) *From the Publishers.*

**Evans, D. Tysil.** *Principles of Hebrew Grammar* Part 1. 8vo. London, 1912.  
*From the Publisher.*

**Farquhar, J. N.** *A Primer of Hinduism.* 2nd edition. 8vo. Oxford, 1912. *From the Delegates of the Clarendon Press.*

**Fergusson, James.** *History of Indian and Eastern Architecture* Revised and edited by J. Burgess and R. P. S. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1910. *From the Publisher.*

**Finot, L.** *L'Inscription de Ban That.* 8vo. Hanoi, 1912.  
*From the Author.*

**Flury, S.** *Die Ornamente der Hukim und Aschar Moschee.* 8vo. Heidelberg, 1912. *From the Publisher.*

**Fraser, Lovat.** *India under Curzon and after* 8vo. London, 1911. *Purchased.*

**Garetang, J.** *Land of the Hittites.* 8vo. London, 1910. *Purchased.*

**Gartner, E.** Komposition und Wortwahl des Buches der Weisheit. 8vo. Berlin, 1912. *From the Publishers.*

**GAZETTEERS.**

**Bengal.** Vol. xax: Jessore. 8vo. Calcutta, 1912.  
*From the Government of Bengal.*

**Burma. Mergui.** Vol. A. 8vo. Rangoon.  
*From the Government of India.*

**Central Provinces. Amraoti.** Vol. A. 8vo. Bombay, 1912.  
*From the Government of India.*

**United Provinces.** Vol. ix, Farrukhabad; vol. xiii, Bareilly. 8vo. Allahabad, 1912. *From the Government of India.*

**Ghose, Babu B. M.** Gharer Katha. Calcutta, 1911.  
*From the Author.*

**Gellancz, H.** The Book of Protection. 8vo. London, 1912.  
*From the Publisher.*

**Graham, W. A.** Siam, Handbook. 2nd edition. 8vo. London, 1912.  
*From the Publishers.*

**Grünwedel, A.** Altbuddhistische Kultstätten in Chinesisch-Turkestan. 8vo. Berlin, 1912. *Purchased.*

**Heber, E. A.** Japanische Industriearbeit. 8vo. Jena, 1912.  
*From the Publishers.*

**Hilka, A.** Die Altindischen Personennamen. (Indische Forschungen, Heft iii.) 8vo. Breslau, 1910. *Purchased.*

**Hiriyanna, M.** Isāvāsy- and Kēnōpanishad translated into English. 2 vols. 8vo. Srirangam, 1911-12.  
*From the Translator.*

**Horton, M.** Theologie des Islam. 8vo. Leipzig, 1912.  
*From the Publisher.*

**Huart, Cl.** Histoire des Arabes. Tome i. 8vo. Paris, 1912.  
*From the Publishers.*

**Huxley, M. I.** Sumerian Tablets in the Harvard Semitic Museum. Part i. Harvard Semitic Series, vol. iii. 4to. Cambridge, U.S.A., 1912. *From the Editorial Committee.*



**India.** Classified Catalogue of the Library of the Director-General of Archaeology. Supplement II. 8vo. Calcutta, 1912.  
*From J. H. Marshall, Esq.*

**Iyer, L. K. Ananta Krishna.** Cochin Tribes and Castes. Vol. ii. 8vo. Madras, 1912.  
*From the Author.*

**Jastrow, M.** Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens. Lief. xix. 8vo. Gießen, 1912.  
*From the Publishers.*

**Kagwa, Sir Apolo.** Ekitabo kya Hasekabaka Beluganda. 8vo. London, 1912.  
*From the Publisher.*

**Kanasawa, S.** Untersuchungen über die Japanischen und Koreanischen Ortsnamen in Alten Zeiten. 8vo. Seoul, 1912.  
*From the Government General of Chosen.*

**Kerestedjian, Bedros Effendi.** Quelques Matériaux pour un Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Turque. Ed. par son Neveu Haig. 8vo. Londres, 1912. *From the Editor*

**KITĀH TĀRIKH NABOLIVAN BONAPARTA AL AWAL.** 8vo. Bairout, 1868.  
*From Dr. A. Tien*

**Lal, Behari.** Science, Religion, and Philosophy Part 1 Cosmogony. 8vo. Agra, 1912. *From the Author*

**Lammens, H.** Fátma et les Filles de Mahomet. 8vo. Roma, 1912.  
*From the Publisher*

**Laufer, B.** Confucius and his Portraits. Pamphlet. 8vo. Chicago, 1912  
*From the Author.*

**Jade, a study in Chinese Archaeology and Religion** 8vo. Chicago, 1912.  
*From the Field Museum of Natural History Chicago.*

**Lidaya, Phraya.** "Traibhum" Buddhist Cosmogony. Ed. with Preface by H.R.H. Prince Damrong. 8vo. Bangkok, 1912.  
*From the Vajiravada National Library.*

**Macdonell, A. A., and Keith, A. Berrisford.** Vedic Index of Names and Subjects. 2 vols. *From the India Office*

**Manassewitsch, B.** Lehrbuch die Arabische Sprache. 4<sup>te</sup> Aufl.  
8vo. Wien [1912]. *From the Publisher.*

**Marçais, W.** Textes Arabes de Tanger. 8vo. Paris, 1912.  
*From the École des Langues Orientales Vivantes, Paris.*

**Martin, W. A. P.** Chinese Legends and Lyrics. 2nd edition.  
8vo. Shanghai, 1912. *From the Publishers.*

**Meyer, E.** Histoire de l'Antiquité. Tome i. Trad. par  
M. David. 8vo. Paris, 1912. *From the Publisher.*

**Nallaswami Pillai, J. M.** Studies in Śaiva Sūdhanta. 8vo.  
Madras, 1911. *Purchased.*

**NEWARK MUSEUM.** The Tibet Collection, Ed. N. Crane  
Memorial. Pamphlet. 8vo. Newark, 1912.  
*From Dr. Berthold Laufer.*

**PENNSYLVANIA UNIVERSITY.** E. B. Cox, jun., Expedition to  
Nubia. Vol. vi: Karanög, by F. Ll. Griffith. 4to.  
Philadelphia, 1911.  
*From the Publishing Committee of the Expedition.*

**Penny, Rev. F.** The Church in Madras. 8vo. London, 1904.  
*Purchased.*

**Pitsudaki, B.** Materials for the Study of the Ainu Language  
and Folk-lore. 8vo. Cracow, 1912.  
*From the Academy of Sciences, Cracow.*

**Pongrácz, Dr. A.** Uebersichte der Magyaren. 8vo. Gyer-  
gyószentmiklós, 1912. *From the Author.*

**Roemer, H.** Die Bābī Bihā'ī. 8vo. Potsdam, 1912.  
*From the Verlag der Deutschen Orient Mission.*

**SĀID L'ANDALOUS, ABOU QĀSIM.** Kitāb Tabaqāt al-Umara.  
Publié par le P. Louis Choikho. 8vo. Beyrouth, 1912.  
*From the Editor.*

**Saito, Hisho.** A History of Japan. Translated by Elizabeth  
Lee. 8vo. London, 1912. *From the Publishers.*

**Sen, R. R.** *The Holy City (Benares).* 8vo. *Chittagong*, 1912.  
*From the Author.*

**Shakespear, Lieut.-Colonel J.** *Luzhei Kuki Clans.* 8vo.  
*London*, 1912. *From the Publishers.*

**SINHALESE MSS.**

*Kavyadipaniya of Hamarajiva.*

*Rajavaliya.* (A History of Ceylon to 800 A.D.)

Pali poem with Sinhalese paraphrase.

*Vamsantara-jataka* (Sinhalese version). 2 copies.

*From the Rev. H. Anderson Meaden.*

**SIYARAT AL-GADISIYYIN AL-YAUMIYAT.** *Abrégé de la Vie des Saints.* Tome i. 8vo. *Mossoul*, 1870. *From Dr. A. Tien.*

**Seane, E. B.** *To Mesopotamia and Kurdistan in Disguise.* 8vo.  
*London*, 1912. *From the Publisher.*

**Tagore, Rabindra Nath.** *Gitanjali.* 8vo. *London*, 1912.  
*From the India Society.*

**Tisdall, W. St. C.** *Christianity and other Faiths.* 8vo.  
*London*, 1912. *From the Publisher.*

**Travancore, H.H.** *Swati Tirunal Sri Rama Varma Kulasekhara Perumal, Maharaja of Bhaktimanjari.* Edited by T. Gajapati Sastri. 8vo. *Trivandrum*, 1904.  
*From the Travancore Government.*

**TRIVANDRUM SANSKRIT SERIES.** Nos. xi-xvii. Ed. by T. Gajapati Sastri. 8vo. *Trivandrum*, 1911-12.  
*From the Travancore Government.*

**Tsurayuki, Ki no.** *The Tosa Diary.* Translated from the Japanese by William N. Porter. 8vo. *London*, 1912.  
*From the Publisher.*

**Van der Tuuk, Dr. H. N.** *Kawi-Balinesech Woordenboek.* Deel iv. 8vo. *Batavia*, 1912.  
*From the Batavian Government.*

**Varma, A. R. Rajaraja.** *Laghu Paniniyam.* 8vo. *Trivandrum*, 1911.  
*From the Author.*

**Vidyadharm, Phra Maha.** A Translation and Commentary on the Kalyani Inscription in Pegu. 8vo. *Bangkok*, 1912.

*From the Vajiravaddana National Library.*

**VIŚĀKHADATTA.** *Mudrārākṣasa.* Edited by A. Hillebrandt. (Indische Forschungen, Heft iv.) 8vo. *Breslau*, 1912.

*From the Publisher.*

**Wagiswara, W. D. C., and Saunders, K. J.** The Buddha's "Way of Virtue". Translated from the Dhammapadam. 8vo. *London*, 1912.

*From the Publisher.*

**Whitworth, G. C.** An Anglo-Indian Dictionary. 8vo. *London*, 1885.

*From the Author.*

**Wied, K.** Leichtfassliche Anleitung zur Erlernung der Türkischen Sprache. 4<sup>te</sup> Aufl. Sm. 8vo. *Wien*, 1912.

*From the Publisher.*

**YANG CHU.** Garden of Pleasure. Translated by A. Forke. 8vo. *London*, 1912.

*From the Publisher.*

**Zadeh, H. Kazem.** Relation d'un Pèlerinage à la Mecque en 1910-11. 8vo. *Paris*, 1912.

*From the Author.*







